

their own sources of power, why isn't it essential to co-ops to do likewise? Of course, it is obvious that not every REA-financed cooperative is going to build its own plant. There are many cases where it is just not feasible, but the knowledge on the part of the private supplier that the co-op could get a G. & T. loan if he needed it seems to me to be the most valuable bargaining lever available to the rural system—and actually it is about the only lever which most of them have.

The authority to make such loans is already in the basic REA Act, and it should remain there. The Congress properly looks to the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool, and yet there are many Members of Congress who, in all good faith, would like to so limit the authority of the Administrator to make G. & T. loans that this bargaining power would be completely destroyed. Not only are there bills pending to destroy this lending power, or to make it ineffective, but the Appropriations Committee actually wrote instructions into the report on its recent appropriation bill which in effect required the Administrator to turn over the financial statements of his borrowers to the private companies. I don't believe that the Appropriations Committee actually realizes what they are doing—and I don't believe that that committee had any moral or parliamentary right to, in effect, write new legislation in its appropriation bill. I protested this action on the floor but to no avail.

The REA is nothing but a banking institution. The cooperatives are its customers. I don't want my banker to turn my financial statement over to my competitor, and I don't believe any honest banker would do so. I don't believe that it is proper or moral for the REA Administrator to call in the co-op's competitors, tell them what the co-op proposes to do, and ask them if they can't take this information and come up with a more attractive plan—and yet on page 8 of the report of the House Appropriations Committee on June 3, 1963, we find the following wording: "Before public funds are loaned for power, generation, or transmission, a majority of the committee believes the REA Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should make a survey, determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable, advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable, and get such contract modified to make it reasonable. Loans should be

made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained." And a little further down they state that such loans "should not be made where local private business can meet the need or where it is determined that the local borrower will provide unnecessary competition."

To me this is a clear requirement that the power companies shall be told what the co-op proposes and shall then be given an opportunity to see if they could not beat the co-op's bid. I think that of course there should be a clearly established need for the service, but the power companies should be required to ignore that need at their own peril.

In other words, it seems to me that the private power company which deliberately refuses to provide adequate service or reasonable rates should not be allowed to continue this policy indefinitely and then when the co-op makes arrangements to finance another source of power to be permitted to come in, make a "death-bed confession" and plead that it is now ready to give that which it would not give until seriously and specifically threatened with a competitive source of power. Obviously, if we are to adopt this policy, and that is exactly what the Appropriations Committee asks us to do, there is going to be no pressure whatever on the private power companies to make any concessions until after the cooperative has gone to the REA seeking a G. & T. loan. This will force every cooperative which needs a power source to apply for a G. & T. loan.

I therefore repeat, private power companies should be required to ignore legitimate needs of the co-ops at their peril. Of course, if a private power company has offered to meet the needs of the co-op, before the co-op takes any steps to get power from another source, I should think that the Administrator should, and must, take that into consideration, and if he found that such an outstanding offer was bona fide and within the power of the company to perform, then he would not approve the loan application.

My quarrel with the Appropriations Committee is not that they want to limit loans to those instances where a reasonable supply of power at reasonable prices cannot be obtained from private sources, but it is in regard to the time at which they want to allow the company to make such an offer, having refused to provide needed power at proper prices. I do not believe that the power companies should be privileged to purge themselves of their default by coming

in after a cooperative has made other arrangements.

Again, I would point out that I do not contend that any power company, in the absence of a special contract, is under obligation to supply wholesale power to a cooperative, but if it wants this cooperative business it should not be allowed to force the cooperative to expose its needs and its possible opportunities of supplying those needs. The company should be required, if it wants the business, to make an attractive offer before, not after, the cooperative applies for a G. & T. loan.

Of course, the real problem in Congress is to get the Members of Congress to understand the situation. Most of the Members of Congress are from large cities and the percentage from large cities is rapidly increasing. These Members naturally feel that they have no interest in REA. It is the responsibility of associations such as yours to educate these Members. Most of them are fair if they can but understand the facts. We should not, however, expect them to have a very clear understanding when so many Representatives from strictly rural areas do not bother to learn the facts except from power company lobbyists.

Of course, I know that you cannot match the power companies in the funds they expend in lobbying but you can see your Congressman. Each local cooperative can make it a definite project to present your problems to your own Congressman. I know that there is a natural disposition to ask: "How can I influence the Congressman in somebody else's district?" I would suggest that except for the big city Congressmen that you not try to influence the Congressman in somebody else's district. Every one of you should be in a position to talk to your own Congressman, but there is mighty little reason why ROR TAYLOR should be concerned with what the people of Chatham County want, or why HERBERT BONNER should be especially interested in the views of the folks of Cherokee County.

When it comes to the big cities, I realize that we must depend more upon a general basic understanding of the people. Probably it is here that organizations like National Rural Electric Cooperative Association can do its best work, and it is here that you are going to find attitudes vitally influenced by party affiliation, but it is also here in the big cities that you are going to obtain or lose the majority in Congress which REA must have if it is to continue to serve our rural people as it has served them in the past.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 19: 14: *Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.*

Eternal God, our Father, in whose divine wisdom, righteousness, and love, we trust, we earnestly beseech Thee that Thou wilt direct us in our halting and hesitant search for the right solution to our many difficult national and international problems.

We pray that our statesmen and diplomats, who are assembling for counsel and conference, may be blessed with Thy favor and a special manifestation of Thy guiding spirit.

Grant that in these days of darkness and danger we may not become disheartened and discouraged, but show us how we may lay hold of the great spiritual resources with increasing tenacity of faith.

May our trust in Thee be a blessed experience and may we make a definite and distinct contribution to the glorious adventure of establishing peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th

Congress, the Chair appoints as Members to the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], Chairman; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT]; the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order anytime during the coming week to take up and to consider a House joint resolu-

tion to provide continuing appropriations.

I have consulted the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and am assured the order would have his approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES A. HALLECK, MINORITY LEADER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it just occurs to me that today marks another milestone in the busy and useful and eventful life of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader of the House.

I believe he is approaching some 30 or 40 years—more or less, as the case may be—and am glad to take advantage of the opportunity to felicitate him and the House and the country on the admirable and tactful and gracious manner in which he has conducted the responsible and important duties of that great office. I have always entertained the warmest admiration for the gentleman—personally and officially—if not politically.

And in this connection it has been interesting to note in the press the widespread and growing sentiment in favor of his nomination for the Presidency. May I assure him that he has my ardent and unqualified support for a position on that ticket.

But at the same time I would be remiss in my friendship if I did not also call attention to the fact that in view of the universal and practically unanimous support of the Nation at large, and apparently of an overwhelming majority of the Senate, of President Kennedy's peace treaty, any nomination at San Francisco will be an entirely futile gesture.

May I extend heartiest congratulations to the gentleman from Indiana and wish for him many happy returns of the day. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have served with him in the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. In view of the announcement previously made, the Chair will recognize the happy event in the life of our distinguished minority leader and in this instance will make an exception.

THE HONORABLE CHARLES A. HALLECK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this is the anniversary of the birth of the distinguished minority leader.

One of the rewarding things about service in the Congress, and one of the great things about the House of Representatives from the standpoint of the welfare of the country, is the fact this House does attract and has attracted over the years many men of outstanding ability, men of great character and devotion to duty. Among the greatest of the great is my friend, the distinguished minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, and on this, the anniversary of his birth, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Missouri in extending to him many happy returns of the day, and many more of them in the years to come.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members on this side of the aisle join with those who spoke a moment ago in extending our very best birthday wishes to the minority leader of the House of Representatives who on two occasions has been majority leader. We wish for him the best of luck and good health in the years to come.

I came to Congress quite a number of years ago, at approximately the same time as did our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He and I have become very warm personal friends. CHARLIE HALLECK has been a great and outstanding leader for our party, he has been and is exceedingly versatile in many ways. He does his job extraordinarily well. We have great admiration and respect for him. We have the utmost confidence in him.

My sincere congratulations to our distinguished leader on his birthday. We hope he will have many more. We trust we will have the benefit of his service in Congress for many years to come.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Illinois and others in what they have said about our outstanding minority leader, CHARLIE HALLECK. He has had a long and illustrious career in public service. I congratulate him on his birthday and hope that he will be able to continue serving his district, State, and Nation for many years in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Anderson	Elliott	Rivers, S.C.
Baring	Gibbons	Roberts, Ala.
Blatnik	Hanna	Shelley
Celler	Harvey, Mich.	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Smith, Va.
Dawson	McIntire	Whitten
Diggs	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Dorn	Pillion	Younger
Edwards	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7885, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 103, ending in line 4, page 5 of the bill.

Are there any further amendments to this section?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we wasted no end of time and it was never possible to clarify certain matters because of continuous conversation on the floor. If there is any idea that Members want to get through today with this bill I would suggest that conversation be held outside the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to say "Amen" to that statement.

The Committee will please be in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORSE: On page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 104. Section 202(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which

relates to authorizations for the development loan fund, is amended by striking the words 'and \$1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and substituting therefor the words '\$1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1963, and \$1,200,000,000 for each of the next succeeding fiscal years.'

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. The effect of the amendment I have offered would be to reduce from \$1,500 million to \$1,200 million the authorization for the development loan funds in the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. This amendment will put our authorization more in line with the demonstrated needs of the program, and will not, in my view, impair the effectiveness of our development program.

Under section 202(a) of the 1961 act, \$1.2 billion was authorized for development loans in fiscal 1962. Of this amount, \$1,112,500,000 was actually appropriated. In fiscal 1963, for which \$1.5 billion was authorized, only \$975 million was appropriated. The Agency for International Development has requested only \$1.06 billion of its \$1.5 billion authorization for fiscal year 1964. Thus, over the past 3 years, including 1964, the funds actually appropriated or requested to be appropriated have totaled \$1,102,500,000 less than that which was authorized by Congress in 1961.

Under section 202(a) of the 1961 act, the unappropriated portion of the amount authorized for any fiscal year could be appropriated in a subsequent year in addition to the amount already authorized for that year, yet the Agency for International Development has not included the unexpended amount in its request for appropriations.

I do not mean to suggest that AID has been less than alert to its opportunities and responsibilities in the development loan field. During the past 5 years AID has made more than 300 loans totaling about \$3.5 billion to countries in various stages of growth and development. As AID has pointed out in its request this year, a number of countries have become practically independent of our assistance. A number of others are moving rapidly toward self-sustaining growth. We can be proud of the part we have played in helping them stabilize their economies, seek new avenues of internal development, strengthen the private sectors of their economies, and move toward a more favorable position in world markets. While we cannot be complacent about the progress we have made, we can stop to appraise the present structure of our program and determine whether it is time to make adjustments in our authorizations for such countries.

The fact that much of the money authorized for development loans has not been spent does not indicate a decreasing need for economic development in many areas of the world. Rather it indicates that the character of our program has changed considerably since 1961.

It further indicates that we are receiving a far greater degree of cooperation from other free world nations than we have in the past.

For example, the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD is now providing about 40 percent of total free

world bilateral aid. These developments are extremely heartening, and they coincide with suggestions made by the President, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Clay Committee and many other experts in the foreign assistance field.

In the light of our own balance-of-payments problems, it seems to me we should cut back our assistance authorizations whenever such action is consistent with our national interest.

This is such an occasion, Mr. Chairman. Decreasing our development loan authorizations for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 will more accurately reflect the demonstrated need for this part of our assistance effort without weakening its effectiveness.

I urge the adoption of this amendment. Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nothing but a paper cut. Let us go back to the Mutual Security Act of 1961. The House will remember that the bill, as it passed the House, had the Treasury borrowing authority stricken from the bill and provided for a 1-year development loan program as a result of the so-called Saund amendment. The bill, as it passed the other body, provided for a 5-year development loan program with authority to borrow from the Treasury \$1,700 million per year over a 5-year period.

As the chairman of the House Committee of Conference, it was my duty to go to conference and oppose the Treasury borrowing principle, which I did. But I did not do it until I came back here and consulted the leaders on both sides of the House, the leaders of the minority and the leaders on the majority side. We worked out a compromise arrangement for a long-range development loan program, where we authorized annual appropriations of \$1,500 million a year for 5 years. We lowered the figure to \$1,500 million a cut of \$200 million below the Senate authorization of \$1,700 million a year projected over a period ending in fiscal year 1966.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, the Executive did not request the full amount of the money authorized although \$1,500 million was authorized. In 1963, only \$975 million was appropriated and, this year they requested an appropriation of only \$1,060 million.

I have great faith in the Committee on Appropriations and especially the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations. They are going to screen the Development Loan Fund requirements very carefully before approving an appropriation. As I said, this is only a paper cut. This is not going to cut a dime out of the bill or require any reduction of the appropriation. The authorization is already contained in existing law. The bill authorizing the money for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 was signed by the President in 1961. We have an established Development Loan Fund projected until 1966, and I cannot see any reason why the House should now backtrack and make a paper cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORSE) there were—ayes 52, noes 90.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MORSE and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 129, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5:

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT GRANTS AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

SEC. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 211(a), which relates to general authority, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (5) contained in the second sentence thereof; and

"(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ', and (7) whether such activity could be financed through a development loan available under title I of this chapter'.

"(b) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out '1963' and '\$300,000,000' and substitute '1964' and '\$217,000,000', respectively.

"(c) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a) strike out 'use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for' and substitute the word 'furnish'.

"(2) In subsection (b) strike out 'to use' and 'foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for' and substitute 'to furnish' before the word 'assistance'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection:

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, for the fiscal year 1964, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, not to exceed \$2,200,000 shall be available for direct dollar costs in carrying out subsection (b) and \$2,000,000 shall be available solely for the purchase of foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time principally to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee handling this bill as to the project about which many Members in the House feel a genuine concern and have felt such concern for a number of years.

Mr. Chairman, in previous considerations of this bill the chairman of the committee has made it very clear that the funds in this bill are designed to assist Project Hope, which is the mercy ship operated by the People-to-People Foundation, and which has rendered so much beneficial help to the people of Vietnam and most recently in Peru in

trying to meet the health problems in these underdeveloped countries and to give assistance in training doctors and public health personnel to better cope with the diseases and the lack of medical training and medical personnel available in those countries.

Mr. Chairman, I know based upon letters which I have read recently by Assistant Secretary of State Fred Dutton and by Mr. David Bell, the very able Administrator of AID, that this project is regarded very highly for the contributions that it has made.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] has indicated his interest and support in this project in the past. I would like, however, to obtain an expression from the chairman of the committee as to the gentleman's feelings about funds for this purpose in the section now under consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman that I am very familiar with Project Hope. As a physician I have had many of my friends take part in this very worthy project. I feel confident that under section 104, subsection (c), the administration would have authority, if money were available, to make loans or grants under this section.

The gentleman recalls that back in 1960, I believe it was, Project Hope did borrow \$1 million from the mutual security program. Their payments on their loan are on schedule. I think they have repaid \$30,000 of the loan.

This has been a project, financed by private fundraising. I feel that this is a very worthwhile project for helping other peoples of the world that could be assisted under the authority of section 104(c). I think it would be a worthwhile project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much. Of course, the principal funds for Project Hope do come from private subscription. The physicians who participate in the program donate their services and do not require any payment from the Government or from any source for what they give to the project. The great pharmaceutical houses of the country contribute millions of dollars in medicines and supplies for this project.

I think when our Government makes a contribution to aid in meeting the operating differential costs which are necessary to keep American seamen aboard it and the American flag flying on it—incidentally, it is also flying proudly the Alliance for Progress flag in Latin America—that we are making a solid contribution to a very worthwhile project.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. There is just one point which the gentleman neglected to emphasize. I should like to point that up. That is the fact that this project also, according to the unanimous testi-

mony of our U.S. Ambassador in the countries which it has visited, has made a tremendous impact upon the people of those countries, one that has been favorable to us and helpful to our foreign policy.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the fact that it has made a tremendous impact. Forty-six thousand people in Peru were directly benefited through medical attention and help during the recent cruise to Peru. I am informed that when rioting was taking place and the American flag was being stoned and attacked in some parts of Peru, no gesture of any kind, no attack of any kind, was made upon Project Hope where it was anchored at Trujillo in Peru. As a matter of fact, the community support for the project was overwhelming.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYMAN: "On page 5, strike out lines 19 through 21, inclusive, and on page 5, line 23, strike out '(c)' and insert in lieu thereof '(b)'."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about the amendment I have offered. It would end a portion of our foreign giveaway. I have waited some 14 years for the opportunity to put a question like this before the House and before the Congress. I used to serve as counsel for the watchdog committee on foreign aid programs way back 14 years ago, and I have deep convictions that the levels, policies, and administration of our foreign aid program has wasted billions of tax dollars.

My amendment would knock out a portion of the outright gift of money in the foreign aid program; \$217 million in lines 19 to 21 would come out if this amendment is agreed to.

I would like to make it clear to the House this amendment deals with gifts of American tax dollars, not loans. It does not deal with the Alliance for Progress. It does not affect money in connection with the so-called claimed-to-be strategic section dealing with supporting assistance. This would cut out and end outright gifts to the extent of \$217 million.

If you will look at page 2 of the committee's report you will find \$6.7 billion is still in the pipeline even if not a single dollar is authorized today.

Mr. Chairman, this program ought to be ended here and now to the extent it is on a giveaway basis. We have been giving away billions of dollars for years as an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States. Our national debt now is over \$308 billion and mounting at the rate of a billion dollars a month—\$217 million in added gifts from a nation \$308 billion in the red is resented by our people.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have had enough of these foreign aid handouts. In the grassroots of America they want this sort of boondoggle ended once and for all. Put your ears to the ground and listen. If you do not hear the

peoples' protests now, I assure you you will hear them next fall. To those who say if we cut off our aid and gifts we are playing into the hands of the Communists, I say, Mr. Chairman, I have helped to fight against communism for many, many years, and, mark this well, there is nothing the Communists would like any more than to see this country spend itself broke with these continued foreign giveaways.

To those who are concerned about our image—and I would like to make it clear I do not impugn the sincerity of any of the gentlemen who have expressed that thought—to those who are concerned about our image abroad may I say that our image abroad during the past 14 years has been one of increasing astonishment, as the people over there and around the world have come to the conclusion that Americans are some kind of genial jackasses with more money than brains and Mr. Chairman we are running out of money. I hope we still have enough brains left to end this foolishness.

With the country in the financial shape it is, the people are demanding that we do not give away any more of our money. If Timbuktu or some distant land needs sidewalks or some other improvement, they should borrow the money for that. Nothing in this amendment affects the lending authority proposed.

To those who raise the security question, the President has \$380 million under section 108 to give away. This amendment does not affect these millions. But as far as outright gifts and grants are concerned, I say let us act for America for once. Let us keep faith with our own people. If we do this our image will have been strengthened, not weakened. So will our self-respect. We in this House are closest to the people. We owe it to our people to lay a greater emphasis on representing them for a change.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. In view of the limitation of 2 percent on development placed in the bill yesterday, how would underdeveloped countries build their water supply systems?

Does the gentleman from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I say borrow it.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will look at the proper sections of the bill he will find that there is appropriated under another section of this bill \$380 million which is given to the President for so-called support assistance. Almost a blank check. This is also grant—gift—money.

From such funds it would be possible for this kind of loan to be made, whatever country may be concerned. But these countries can borrow from this country on extremely liberal terms over 40 years. I do not think they can get terms like that anywhere else in the world.

Mr. BARRY. I have great respect for the gentleman's sincerity. I wish however to point out, that if we were to lend over \$1 billion this year, which we are authorized to do under our development

loan program, we would charge only \$300 million in interest, were the interest rate to remain at the rate prior to our putting in the 2-percent limitation yesterday; but now we are imposing an additional \$500 million obligation on the repaying countries for the \$1 billion that we are lending them. In other words, a total of \$800 million will now be collectible by the United States on \$1 billion of development loan funds.

Mr. WYMAN. Over a 40-year period it should.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take out the complete section which finances the point 4 program. This has been a part of our foreign aid program dating back to 1949. In my opinion this is the most effective part of the program. This is the money that finances the sending of American technicians into these undeveloped countries. Under this program we have 5,000 of them overseas including teachers, engineers, surveyors, and other specialists, helping these undeveloped countries. This money is not all packaged up in bushel baskets to be handed out to countries as grants. This is the point 4 program. If we are ever going to help these undeveloped countries to develop their own resources we are going to help them by means of a program like this.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Sometimes this program is known as the technical assistance program. Is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. Is it not true that there is not a religious group in the United States, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or what have you, that does not endorse this program?

Mr. MORGAN. One thousand percent correct.

The committee went over this section very well. The executive asked for \$257 million. We screened the projects, and we cut the bill. We cut this section by \$40 million, a substantial cut. Under this program we bring many people from undeveloped countries to this country for training. This is not actually a program, as the gentleman seemed to indicate where we take this money over there and give it away.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Do they pay us anything back on this?

Mr. MORGAN. Most of this money goes to pay for our own people we send over there. Their salaries are paid out of this.

Mr. WYMAN. Their salaries are paid under this authorization?

Mr. MORGAN. Their salaries are paid out of this authorization, but we are

not giving this money to foreign countries.

Mr. WYMAN. Is all of this not an outright grant or gift for the purpose of technical assistance in point 4 as well as these salaries? Is it all not an outright gift?

Mr. MORGAN. If this troubled world needs any kind of economic aid, it needs this technical assistance program.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that American programs in the United States have benefited by this program?

Mr. MORGAN. It supplements the work of CARE, the Red Cross, and similar organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I should like to add to what the gentleman said about foreigners being unable to understand how we can be suckers enough to give away all this money.

Let me quote very briefly from the London Weekly Review, under date of August 2 of this year. After asking in effect, the question of, "How can they be doing these things?" it says:

The true cause of the dollar's weakness is the huge sums doled out by America to Communist or semi-Communist countries. Not only is this money being used against American interests, but it is causing the drain on America's vital reserves.

If this were not actually happening, no one would believe such an incredible policy to be possible. What influence behind the state scene compels this suicidal policy?

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House says this fund promotes technical assistance throughout the world. I hope there are enough of these books available, a copy of which I have here, that are put out by the Agency for International Development entitled "Current Technical Service Contracts," so that every Member who would like to see what is going on can get a look at some of these contracts and the amounts of the contracts; the consultants that are being hired and sent out all over the world. There is \$438 million worth of contracts and consultants represented in this one book.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Our friend, the gentleman from New York, used as an example, Tunisia and the waterworks project that might possibly be built in Tunisia through funds authorized by this particular section in the bill. I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa and our friend, the gentleman from New York, that we have a Public Law 480 program in Tunisia which is generating annually approximately \$9 million of the currency of Tunisia. These funds, which are in two

categories—counterpart and U.S.-owned, are available for economic development purposes in Tunisia, and could be made available for the waterworks project which the gentleman from New York is worried about. I do not think Tunisia is a very good example for the gentleman to use.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to call attention again to the Members of the House, if they have considered this whole question in the report of the committee which talks about this grant criteria which indicates a different picture than the chairman just indicated.

On page 13, it appears the committee itself says:

Over the past several years there has been a slight decline in development grant and technical cooperation programs in various countries as a result of greater use of loans.

Then a little bit below it says that they cut the authorization to \$217 million and they state:

There is a perceptible trend toward loans in lieu of grants, a trend which the committee wishes to encourage.

Then, further in the report on page 50, we find in the report the committee itself has inserted a new condition in italics:

Whether such activity could be financed through a development loan available under title I of this chapter.

I would like to observe this, Mr. Chairman. We need more attention to the needs of America and the needs of this country rather than the undeveloped countries on this grant basis. There is plenty of money in this program and plenty of money in the pipeline to take care of this situation. But at this point, the resentment of the American people is focused on this fact and they want this kind of grant cut out of our program.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire, who, in his first year in Congress is making excellent contributions to this debate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to clear up something that the gentleman mentioned. Of course, wherever an undeveloped country recovers as a result of technical assistance, we want to shift from a grant basis to a loan program, and that is what the report says.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me, there is no undeveloped country anywhere in the world—not a single one that has been left untouched to the tune of several million up to several billion dollars of American cash?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes, there are undeveloped countries throughout the world that can be helped.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a single country that has been left untouched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if there were any single section of this bill that ought not to be cut out it is this section. This is the section that has done, in my opinion, more good than anything in the foreign aid program. This section gets down to the grass roots and it gets down to the things that need to be done. As I said earlier, there was not a single religious group that has not written to this committee or that has not testified before this committee in support of this section. I do not agree with what the gentleman says about the image of America. I have traveled abroad—sometimes my opponents say, too much—but I have successfully weathered that. And I do not profess, as he apparently does, to be an expert on jackasses, but I do not think the people of the world think Americans are that. I think the people of the world who have had the benefit of the expenditures under the technical assistance program think this is an American program that is designed to help them to find the way to live like human beings.

This is a program that goes to the village level. This is a program that teaches them how to bore a hole in the ground to get water instead of drinking out of some contaminated stream.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman is saying. I know of contracts that have been entered into under this program involving medical programs which have done tremendous good, particularly in Latin America. We are concerned about the spread of Castroism and we are concerned about what has happened in Cuba, but undramatically and without fanfare and without publicity these programs have been carried on which have done much to defeat Castroism and communism.

I will give you an example or two. This agency made a contract with Tulane and Louisiana State University Medical Schools to go into Colombia, one of our neighbors in South America. That country was literally scourged with a disease called yaws, which disease can be cured, as most of us know, by the use of simple antibiotics. Today those people who suffered from a crippling ailment which incapacitated them completely are, most of them, operating through this program, cured. In my judgment, that does more to stop communism and create a proper image of the United States of America working through our established universities and research grants and so on than anything that I can think of. To defeat this program, in my judgment, would be the finest thing we can do to help the spread of communism in Latin America.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I just want to say that this is the program which is the theme of the book "The Ugly American." You hear that book quoted in many places and you hear it quoted as criticizing parts of

the program. However, the hero of the book, the man who made friends for America, was a technician who was out there working under the point 4 program down at the village level, helping the people to help themselves. If we want to help these underdeveloped countries and help them to help themselves, this is the one program to do that and it is the last thing we ought to cut out of this bill.

I want to say to you I am going to vote for some cuts in this bill and for some amendments offered on the other side, but I plead for you to vote against the amendment on this one. This is the heart of the program and this is the thing that is making friends for America in the world. If you want to destroy that, then I say vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to speak at this time in favor of the amendment. In view of the points made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Louisiana, I realize that, like many things, there are many illustrations and examples of what is done that are good. However, this program in the overall is so bad, and I believe now dangerous, that we need, after 15 or 18 years, to begin to wake up to the fact that this type of foreign policy has failed and that it is high time that we begin to review it and see if we do not need to approach this thing in some other way.

Now, with reference to the particular point before us, I happen to serve, as you know, on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, where we have a chance to go into these subjects perhaps less thoroughly, may I say, than the members of this committee. I happen to have the problem of getting through the Congress the funds for the Department of Agriculture, at least I serve as chairman of the subcommittee. Let me tell you that in this program, despite the fine work mentioned by the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Ohio, a few years ago when our agricultural commodities were backing up on the United States to the extent of billions of dollars worth and such commodities were being counted by the Department to reduce the acreage in the United States, putting thousands of Americans out of business, our investigation showed that our Government through this program was paying 728 agricultural experts to increase the agricultural production in the competitive countries to us around the world, and that is a matter of record.

May I say to you at this time that our Nation promoted the Common Market in Europe on the theory that it would strengthen these countries so they could help defend us. Now it has gotten strong and we are there on their door-

step beseeching them not to exclude our commodities from coming in. And if we are excluded, may I say to you they will be able to do it because the very commodities that in the past the United States exported to the Common Market countries, they can now get from other foreign countries whom we put into business for export.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Greek-Turkish loan and for a number of years, in my district thereafter I said that if I had to cast the deciding vote, I would have voted for it, because it was the only foreign policy that we had. Time has passed. We should have learned; but how long will it take us to wake up? Do you not realize that in foreign aid we are sticking ourselves and our money into the internal affairs of 100 countries around the world, underwriting the powers that be, so that the other side will hate us as soon as they kick the present authorities out?

Take the situation in Vietnam. I heard the testimony of our experts about Vietnam. We are trying to make villages that never heard of a central government submit to a central government of our choosing. Yes, and talk about religious freedom—just read the pages of the daily newspapers.

We talk about Cuba. Our problem in Cuba was because of this. We had committed ourselves around the world, when we had the atomic bomb and Russia did not, and we said, "We will take care of you"; we said that right and left around the world. And this is a matter of record.

Then when Russia, through Castro, moved into Cuba, there is no doubt we could have shoved them out, but we had gotten ourselves so extended around the world that we could not shove them out without being forced out of a half dozen places ourselves.

And then right here in the United States, it is my recollection that we voted out \$600 million right off to South and Central America without even a plan, in an effort to try to slow the march of events in Central and South America and in effect pay tribute to keep them from following Cuba.

You cannot go into the other fellow's country with your money and your personnel, with your people, and make them submit to the powers that be, the government that we choose, without the other side hating us as soon as they do kick them out. And you can look around the world today and see that this has happened in many places.

As long as we are overextended, as long as we have promises that we cannot carry out around the world, you are going to see what will happen to our Government in places other than Cuba, in my opinion. Even now many are bowing and scraping to Castro. Of course, we could whip him in a minute, but we cannot in view of all this involvement in the four corners of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that I have been right through the years, but I do say when you look around us today and see that things are worse instead of better, then it is high time that we

looked at this program to see if perhaps we need some other approach.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one, may I say to my distinguished colleague, to say that there have not been mistakes in the point 4 program. The gentleman mentioned Vietnam. The military setup in this bill is almost sacred and the effort in Vietnam has been military. Who is going to sit here this afternoon and say that that has been a howling success?

Certainly there have been some mistakes in the point 4 program. As I said I would be the last to deny it, because probably nobody has been more critical of these people than I have before the committee. But because there have been mistakes, are you going to wipe out all of the good, do away with all of the technical assistance, wipe out the one part of the program that the groups who have really been in the field, the missionaries, the religious groups, say is good? Are you going to wipe that out and leave the sad spectacle of what is going on in Vietnam and other places, where the operations are purely military?

Mr. WHITTEN. I recognize the two points that the gentleman made earlier. Let me read to you briefly, if I may, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it is generally accepted that our friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], longtime chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the foreign aid appropriation, probably knows as much about this bill and about this program as anybody. I think nobody on the floor would disagree with that. I agree with what he said to us last year.

I quote:

Now I want to make the following 11 statements:

First. The appropriations for foreign aid, including interest on the public debt for fiscal 1963 on the money that we have borrowed to give away, and back-door financing will exceed \$12 billion this year.

Second. The foreign aid program is a major factor contributing to the continuing annual increase in our public debt.

Third. Foreign aid is primarily responsible for our annual budget deficits.

Fourth. Foreign aid is almost entirely responsible for our balance-of-payments deficit.

Fifth. Foreign aid is responsible to a very large extent for the flight of our disappearing gold reserves to other nationals all over the world.

Sixth. The cost of foreign aid is the major reason for our ever-increasing noncompetitive position in world markets.

Seventh. Foreign aid is rapidly depleting our wealth and resources.

Eighth. The claim to the effect that 80 percent of our foreign aid money is spent in America and thereby creates prosperity is a myth, and a calculated misrepresentation intended to keep the American people supporting the program. Foreign aid contracts are now carefully shuffled out to manufacturers, schools, colleges, universities, workshops and consultants in the 50 States of the Union, so as to attract support and cause it to appear that this giveaway of our wealth is making our Nation prosperous.

Ninth. The foreign aid program as presently operated is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.

Tenth. Many of the nations which are recipients of our aid are rapidly losing faith in America's ability to manage its economic and monetary systems.

Eleventh. We are, in this bill, setting up the machinery by which to borrow money from former and present aid-recipient nations in order to indirectly finance the aid program for this year if other means fail.

Mr. Chairman, that is a statement from the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, made to the Members of this House last year.

May I make this one statement: I repeat, if ever in history any group has made speeches, every one of which on this bill up to now indicates that there should be a thorough review of our foreign policy, you have done it, you have done it, and all of the rest.

Mr. Chairman, I plead in the interest of our own safety and security that you gentlemen with this responsibility realize that you are going to have to draw some lines, take a look at it, and let us pull in our ducks where we can protect them, instead of inviting the Castros in Cuba that we are helpless to push out.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a broadside attack on certain areas of foreign aid. But does the gentleman realize the impact that this amendment would have? It would strike the entire development grant program around the world. Does the gentleman realize the impact that it might have on the malaria control program? Does the gentleman realize the impact that it might have on training people in Africa and newly emerging nations? Do we know, based upon anything that has been said here by the gentleman or the author of the amendment, what the worldwide impact of this amendment would be?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say this to my majority leader? May I say that the motion I made was to strike out the requisite number of words, because I believe that this should be done thoroughly and with our eyes open, because of the points that the gentleman from Oklahoma has made.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned the Congo. There is an example of what we have done. Our Nation did not insist that other Congo provinces be subjected to Katanga Province, which had shown some ability to govern itself. No, this Nation through the foreign aid-United Nations approach made the Katanga Province subject itself to the central government, of the Congo, neither province of which has ever shown any ability to govern itself.

May I say again that I do not know of a single speech that has been made in behalf of this bill which did not show the need to review foreign aid and the United Nations approach and change our direction.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a profound respect for my friend and colleague from

my neighboring State of Mississippi who just addressed the Committee. But if my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman has never supported this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I supported the Greek-Turkish loan but I have not voted for it since. I repeatedly said in earlier years that if it took my vote to pass the Marshall plan I probably would vote for it because it represented the only foreign policy we had. I said subsequently I would not vote for it under any condition because of what the years have shown. It is competing on production we have promoted for export, I pointed out.

Mr. BOGGS. I have not misstated the gentleman's position. I am glad the gentleman said that since the Greek-Turkish program he had not voted for any of these programs, which would mean the Marshall plan and all of the other programs that have come along since the conclusion of World War II.

I realize that the gentleman has made a broadside attack also on the whole foreign policy of the Government of the United States. I think in order to set the record straight we should look back just a little bit and realize that back in 1952 this country changed administrations and we elected a great general as President of the United States. He brought in his own team.

He brought in his own team and called it a team, as a matter of fact. He brought in Mr. John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, a distinguished American, now gone to his reward. He brought in other people. He brought in a former Governor of Massachusetts and a former Member of this body, Governor Herter, as Secretary of State later in his administration.

Throughout the 8 years of the Republican administration teams went all over the world looking at the foreign aid program, mutual assistance program, the Development Loan Fund, the predecessor to the Alliance for Progress program, and so on. Did they change them? They did not. Did President Eisenhower say this program was ineffectual and that we ought to abandon it? He did not. Did Secretary Dulles say we should abandon it? He did not.

I would be the last person on earth to say there are not difficulties and problems, maladministration, and misinformation, in a program of this kind. Certainly there is. We are the leading nation in the world. How does the gentleman from Mississippi propose that we maintain our leadership if we are not a part of the world? I wonder where the notion comes from that we can be the richest nation on earth, the strongest nation on earth, and yet not participate in the affairs of the earth? That is really what is involved here.

The gentleman from Mississippi did not speak to the specific amendment. He did not speak to the specific proposal. But if we abandon this part of the programs we are not saying to the world that we will not share any of our wealth,

any of our supply of material resources. What we would be saying to the world is that we will not share our knowledge, we will not share our know-how.

The gentleman from Mississippi complains about our teaching people in backward places how to grow food because it may be competitive. What does the gentlemen want to do? Does he want us to let them starve to death so that we can have some more Public Law 480 programs and send it to them free so we can pay his farmers and the farmers in my State?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Mississippi complained about the growing of food while we are piling up surpluses. Does the gentleman think there would be any hungry people in any foreign country or in this country if they could afford to buy those surpluses? We are trying to teach them how to help themselves to fight hunger.

Mr. BOGGS. The population of this earth is exploding. All of us know that. The population all over this earth is growing at a tremendous rate. Are we going to say to peoples living everywhere that we will not share our know-how with them?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I can no longer remain silent in this debate. I have great respect for my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire. I, too, am concerned about some of the costs involved in the foreign aid program. I am sure that we do have clear balance-of-payments problems, and I believe we can cut down on some of our foreign aid costs in some areas.

But it seems to me that the debate in the House has not been directed clearly and affirmatively to leaving with the various embassies and the chiefs of mission that we have throughout the world the tools and the flexibility with which to conduct effective and well administered foreign aid programs. I do not believe that it is wise to support a proposition that would raise our loans from three-fourths of 1 percent to 2 percent. This reduces the flexibility.

Very clearly there are some areas of the world where we must make low interest loans. We must help build roads and other public facilities. This can only be conducted by some of the governments. There are no free enterprise entities to do it. To the extent we do not help in the construction of some public facilities which are not revenue producing we can also hurt the development of the private sector in many of these countries.

In the case of the technical assistance program—this program can be and over the years has been very important. This is the guts of our foreign aid program. A number of administrations have supported it. It is essential, in my opinion, in many areas of the world.

If we wish to cut foreign aid, that is one matter, but let us not cut the tools

and the flexibility of our program. Let us not handcuff our ambassadors in the field.

In the TC programs there are a number that have been phased out. I was one of those who on instructions from the State Department phased out our first TC program in Israel, because in that country they had developed the skills and techniques necessary. The program had served its purpose and Israel was already exporting some of these skills.

I can assure you in all earnestness that this TC and development grant program is important. It has been the backbone of our USOM and AID missions. I believe it is essential to the effectiveness of our foreign aid program. A number of these TC programs can be phased out, but we should by all means support, and vigorously support, the TC programs in a number of areas where we need technical experts, where Americans have to go in and help the people in connection with health, agriculture, industry, marketing, schools, public administration, and a variety of technical services. This I think is essential.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to compliment the gentleman. I happen to have had the good fortune of visiting the gentleman when he served with distinction as one of our Ambassadors. I congratulate him on the statement he is making. The gentleman speaks from experience.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, too, should like to compliment the gentleman on his statement. He has underlined the importance of the technical assistance program, which is now under consideration. In view of the action taken yesterday with respect to development loans, and the acceptance of a floor on the interest rate which can be charged, these development grants become even more important, rather than less important. They are an essential part of the foreign aid program itself.

Mr. REID of New York. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. This is very important. I think it is important to our foreign aid program. I hope the House will support our ambassadors in the field and give them the tools to do an effective kind of job or else administer the kind of job that our country should have and the kind of job that is essential to further social and economic justice and to the cause of freedom and independence of many countries throughout the world.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In line with the gentleman's statement, I should like to state that under this grant program we have presently over 70 contracts with American universities. We have over 5,000 technicians from the universities in the field.

I would like to point out we have 5,000 technicians from the underdeveloped countries presently studying in American universities. So we are creating a dialog with people from foreign countries and underdeveloped countries and also establishing person-to-person contacts in those countries that will be mutually beneficial, and I compliment the gentleman, who shares the views expressed by former President Eisenhower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I share the opinion as expressed in the gentleman's remarks that the guts of the program at one time was in the point 4 program. In fact the theory of foreign aid was very much in this area. When you talk about the amount though, which is now down to around \$200 million or thereabouts, it becomes very obvious what has happened to the basic theory of foreign aid. When we hear some of the comments that were made by people who are knowledgeable, including the majority leader, talking about malaria control which has nothing to do with this particular program, or my good friend, the gentleman from New York, who talks in terms of a water project in Morocco, which is better suited to fit under a loan program, certainly in my judgment, we begin to realize how far removed we are from these basic concepts. May I say this, the real theory behind the point 4 program, which I share by the way, is the person-to-person approach. Back in 1954, the feeling was that the best way to move forward in our foreign aid programs, the theories of which I have supported, was to do as much as we can through the private sector. I offered an amendment which became law to the Internal Revenue Code to provide an additional 10 percent reduction for donations to churches, hospitals and educational institutions. I was anxious to channel as much help into the real person-to-person programs, which are in the private sector. These have been our missionary programs, and I do not mean just our church missions but I mean our educational missions and our public health missions, in the private sector. And I heard their names taken in this debate, to me, almost in vain, because your point 4 program, whatever it is, is a Government program and not private; not really person to person. If we would only call attention to what is being done in the private sector and see if we can build upon that. Now I think that probably there is still some need to enlarge this person-to-person approach, and there is a place besides to supplement the real person-to-person program in the private sector. But to supplement it, let us understand it. I have yet to see our Foreign Affairs Committee come in or our Appropriations Committee come in with any estimate or understanding of the tremendous work still going on in the private sector; and not in Government.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has mentioned my name, will he yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has accused me of being clear off base on this matter, I would like to read from printed policy statements or publications of the Department of State.

Mr. CURTIS. Wait; before the gentleman begins, may I direct his attention to what I said. The gentleman mentioned malaria control, that is under a different section of the bill. That is all I said. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ALBERT. That is not all of it.

Mr. CURTIS. All right, go ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. This statement says:

About a fifth of the total grant program for the region is in the field of health, including extensive malaria eradication programs. The fight against malaria, however, has passed its peak, and the funds spent on all health programs have declined about 15 percent since 1961 as a result.

Then it gives examples and specifically states that the grant program has been important in the eradication of malaria.

Mr. CURTIS. My basic comment would be that the malaria program is under a different section and obviously this is an example of the redundancy that exists.

I have one other remark I want to make, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The day before yesterday and yesterday I was trying to call attention to the figures that have been used by proponents of this foreign aid program stating that 80 percent of the moneys are being spent here in this country. Because of my great concern with the balance-of-payments problem—and this really bears directly on it—I felt first of all that the 80 percent figure was unsubstantiated.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CURTIS. I think the record is pretty clear that that 80-percent figure is unsubstantiated. But the point I was seeking to drive home is that if the 80-percent figure were true, we would be going against the basic theory of foreign aid which is embraced in this person-to-person approach that your point 4 program seeks to supplement. The bulk of point 4 money is spent in the country concerned, not in the United States.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to say to the gentleman that there is concern in the Committee on Foreign Affairs about the private sector and about the work being done by the various religious groups. We had them before us year after year and they testified before us, so we know what they are doing. As a matter of fact, I think I share the gentleman's concern, and I said to them a couple of years ago, "I just wish it were possible to turn this whole technical assistance program over to you people to run it." I think they might run it better, but they are unable and unwilling to take that responsibility but they have testified re-

peatedly that the people in the field work with them and supplement what they are doing and that there is a great deal of cooperation and collaboration between them.

Mr. CURTIS. May I say to the gentleman—and I appreciate his making these statements—that if I unwittingly in my remarks implied that there is no concern on the part of the committee, I had no intention to do so, but what I was directing your attention to is that in the reports and the hearings we never did get the figures on how much was being done dollarwise in this area so that we could evaluate the supplements. I know you have the concern for it, and I do not know but what, from what the gentleman says, that we might share the same approach to it.

Mr. HAYS. It is difficult to get the figures because some organizations do not want to make them public and do not like to give them to us for fear that somehow or other the Government might be running their business. We would like to do this if we could, I think.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned in listening to the arguments made in the well of this House here today by some of the supporters of this program who say, "Are you not concerned about the poor people in India?" or "Are you not concerned about the poor people in Africa?" or "Do you not care about the hungry people in Pakistan?" Sure I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about tax burdened folks in west Texas who are paying for this giveaway, and I am more concerned about the poor and hungry people in the 50 United States than I am about the hungry people in the various 100 or 112 countries around the world. Sure I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about my own family's security and about clothes and shoes for my own children and the children within our own country. Before we start paying out our hard earned money to pay for someone else's groceries, medicines, and pleasures, let us take care of our own, let us be concerned about our own country and our own families first.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. You are also concerned about boring holes in the ground to get water in Texas, are you not? With the water problem we have here in America if the United States is going to give away millions looking for water we need it right here.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, certainly I am. But we are not asking for Federal aid to do it with. We only ask for a little tax freedom, a little reduction in foreign aid giveaways, so we can do it ourselves.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, there has been a little more heat than light cast on many of the aspects of this pro-

gram in relation to this amendment. This is a \$4 billion bill. Where are you going to cut if you are going to cut out any of the money for this program? Out of the most likely candidate for savings of our dollars. Out of the grant program and gifts. There are two sections that relate to grants principally. One is \$217 million authorized in this bill for the purpose of technical assistance and development, and the other is \$380 million authorized for so-called supporting assistance in section 108. This supporting assistance, as I read the committee's report, is claimed to be directed primarily to political and security objectives allied with our own. There has been talk about the countries in various areas of the world where their economic stability is considered to be relatively important to our security here. But in the testimony to the committee itself on page 104 of the hearings let us see what are the true facts. Mr. Bell testified to a claimed need for \$435 million for supporting assistance and \$1.4 billion for military assistance.

None of this is touched by this amendment.

For the Alliance for Progress, \$850 million, under a previous administration. That is not touched by this amendment.

For development loans outside Latin America, \$1,060,000,000;

For development grants outside Latin America, \$257,000,000;

For all other purposes, \$218,000,000:

None of this except grants, better called gifts, outside Latin America is affected by this amendment.

This amendment has nothing to do with Latin America.

The \$217 million that would be taken out by this amendment deals solely with give-away programs outside of Latin America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may ask the author of the amendment a question?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could the gentleman tell us how many hundreds of millions of dollars would be left in the pipeline for this program in the event his amendment were adopted? I am sure it would be a considerable amount.

Mr. WYMAN. In the committee's report the estimate was that the unexpended balances in the foreign assistance program, military and nonmilitary, including the Alliance for Progress, but excluding investment guarantees, \$6.7 billion.

Mr. MORGAN. But very little technical assistance money is included in this total.

Mr. WYMAN. The purpose of the amendment is clearly to eliminate these grants. This amendment is designed to tell our friends that with our fiscal crisis here at home we have reached the end of the road on grants and gifts—at least until the budget is in balance once again.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I commend him for his sound, responsible approach to cut down the many irresponsible giveaways in the costly programs. I endorse his amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 77; noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARRY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: On page 5, line 21, strike out "\$217,000,000" and insert "\$317,000,000."

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, for want of a better title to my amendment rather than calling it a \$100-million increase, I should say this is a "help Pakistan amendment."

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we took action on increasing interest rates. I just want to give the members of the committee an idea of what the action of the committee will do to the country of Pakistan. There will be other countries which will be affected by that amendment. They also are our staunch allies. However, let us just take Pakistan and consider the future of our loan policy with respect to that country.

The loans I am about ready to read to you have already been made. So these particular loans will not be affected. But since we have a 5-year consortium which involves both Pakistan and India, I would like very much to show the members of the committee the damaging effect of what we did yesterday.

Pakistan has a total of \$250 million worth of loans at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent interest with us at the present time. Were this 2-percent increase to apply to this group of loans, they would pay over \$100 million more in interest over the life of those loans than they will pay under the present rate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what about the situation in Pakistan? The gentleman from Texas rose and said he was interested in the people of west Texas. I do not think there is a Member in the House today who is not interested in the people of west Texas or any other constituency. But let us examine and compare the capability to support themselves and to advance economically of the people of west Texas and the people of Pakistan. The average per capita income in Pakistan is \$75 per person. The average per capita income in this country is 30 times greater. The opportunity for the people in west Texas to better themselves is obviously clear. The misfortune of birth in Pakistan insofar as economic betterment is concerned is obviously clear. Therefore, the comparison is perfectly ridiculous, when we are talking about the great effort now being made in the world for economic improvement. I hope that we can have some kind of economic betterment in other nations who are willing to die for us and who are willing to support the underbelly of Asia against the onrush of communism. Surely we should be willing to support them with military assistance to maintain their independence,

and economic aid to create the economic stability and viability that prevents communism from getting a foothold.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to mention a few projects in Pakistan that would have been affected if the 2 percent interest rate had been in effect at the time the loans were negotiated. Malaria control over \$3 million would have been affected. The salinity control program in the amount of \$10.8 million would have been affected. The general commodity loan program amounting to \$30 million—a program involving commodities that Pakistan needs badly to maintain itself economically and in a position to be a staunch ally of the United States—would be affected.

There is further a \$2 million loan for a feasibility study to determine how Pakistan can be a stronger nation in the future.

Some Members might ask, what has a \$100 million increase in technical assistance to do with our loan program? Well, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said, in the course of the debate on the last amendment, that technical assistance is all the more important because of what we did yesterday. He was undoubtedly suggesting that a larger technical assistance program will now be necessary because grants will be needed instead of loans in some instances when the country involved will be unable to pay the higher interest rate. I agree with that and I feel that we ought to increase our technical assistance because of what we did yesterday. The shortsightedness of one day has to be paid for on the following day.

Mr. Chairman, I say that in order for us to act responsibly on legislation affecting our Nation's position in world affairs, we must dig out the facts, review them carefully, and ascertain what may happen in the future as a result of our decisions. We must be aware of the consequences of our actions—consequences which may reverberate throughout the entire world and adversely affect our good allies—allies like free China, Pakistan, India, Greece, Turkey, and others. We cannot realize the effect of what we are doing on the floor of the Congress unless we dig deep and get all the facts. In the very limited time that was available to me, I have tried to put together some facts relating to our programs in just one country, and to show what effect the action of the House yesterday could have on our activities in that country. This, however, is just a single example. To understand the full import of the amendment adopted yesterday, we must consider our programs in many other countries—programs which will be also placed in jeopardy by the operation of that amendment.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have offered the amendment to increase the authorization for technical assistance. I think this increase is fully justified in view of the action of the committee with respect to the interest rate on development loans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the adoption of my amendment will serve to restore

some respectability to the great 15-year-old technical assistance program and show that America is willing to teach less privileged people how to improve themselves. This is a "show-how" program in which we use our technical ability, our engineers and our "know-how." This money does not flow away to other countries to be spent. This money is used to bring American industry and engineering ability to those people, who recognize our leadership, and show them how they can improve themselves through the industrial genius that has brought America the highest standard of living in the history of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence after "wholly owned" insert "(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 percent of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "\$1,300,000,000" in the proviso and substitute "\$2,500,000,000".

(3) In paragraph (2) strike out "\$180,000,000" in the third proviso and substitute "\$300,000,000".

(4) In paragraph (2) strike out "1964" in the fourth proviso and substitute "1965".

(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" in both places it appears and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b) (4) (F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f)."

(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit

of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part."

(f) Amend section 222 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In making a determination to issue a guaranty under section 221(b), the President shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States."

(g) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b) strike out "\$60,000,000" and substitute "\$150,000,000".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I had intended at this point to offer an amendment, but I think instead I shall try to make my point by simply explaining the objectives of this amendment. As shown by the committee report on this bill—page 19—in order to encourage private investments in underdeveloped countries, the Government guarantees certain approved private loans. In order to provide a guarantee for these private investments, a reserve has been established to back up the full faith and credit of the United States.

This pooling arrangement of reserves, I think, is a very meritorious arrangement. Under it, various categories of funds are used to discharge any liabilities under Government guaranties. In order of priority, these categories are first, fee income; second, currencies or other assets collected in connection with the loan; third, funds previously appropriated to provide the guarantee reserve; fourth, funds realized from sale of notes issued under authority of the Mutual Security Act and the Economic Cooperation Act—I point this category up especially because, as will be recognized, this is Treasury borrowing authority or back-door spending—and, fifth, funds hereafter appropriated.

As I said, I think the pooling arrangement is good, but my amendment would have changed it in order that after June 30, 1964, the authority to sell notes, as in four above, would terminate. In other words, what my amendment was intended to accomplish was to provide that borrowing authority would not be used as a means of settling liabilities. Rather, future appropriations would be necessary if there were losses under this guarantee.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that to borrow money to pay losses when such borrowing will have to be paid by an appropriation later is hardly a proper way of facing up to payment of a Government liability. It is just putting off until some future day the accounting for the losses under such programs. I think it is logical to specify that fees charged for the investment guaranties should

be called on to pay any losses first. That makes sense. Then, when these fees are exhausted, the next call is on proceeds from the sale of any assets acquired in the course of closing out a guarantee case in which a loss has been incurred. That also makes sense. Then funds previously appropriated for the purpose would be next called on to cover any losses. When these three sources are exhausted, it seems to me, and my amendment would have so provided, that appropriated funds would be in order and not the unnecessary, illogical, and confusing back-door Treasury borrowing authority as a source of ready funds to pay losses that can never be repaid to the Treasury except by direct appropriation or note cancellation.

I would have liked to have seen the withdrawal of this back-door borrowing authority after June 30, 1964, but I sense the temper of the House and feel that this technically complicated matter would probably not be adopted, or even if it were, would probably come out in conference with the Senate, so I simply raise the issue and urge that in the course of time this \$199 million for back-door authority should be eliminated. Perhaps the Foreign Affairs Committee will give me an opportunity, before next year's authorization bill is reported to the House, to appear and present my views on this matter. Meanwhile, let me say that I appreciate the patience of the Committee in letting me present this matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), amend the next to the last sentence thereof by inserting immediately after "reasonable terms" the following: "(including private sources within the United States), the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest".

(2) In subsection (e), strike out "economical" and substitute "economically".

(3) In subsection (f) strike out "Agency for International Development" and substitute "agency primarily responsible for administering part I".

(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended by inserting immediately after "1963" the second time it appears therein the following: "and not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 10 strike lines 6 through 10 and substitute the following:

"(b) Amend section 252, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, which relates to authorization to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this title, in addition to other funds available for such purposes for fiscal year 1964 not to exceed \$450,000,000, which sums are authorized to remain available until expended, and which except for not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall be available only for loans

payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], a little while ago said that he was going to be voting for some cuts in this bill. I hope he starts about now to vote for a few cuts because I want to reciprocate. I want to vote for the amendment that he promised the Foreign Affairs Committee he would offer dealing with a character known as Dictator Sukarno over in Indonesia. So, I hope the gentleman begins now to help out in voting for some cuts.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, I would prefer to get to that a little later, if you do not mind.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought—that it would be manana or something like that.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides an annual authorization of \$600 million to the so-called Alliance for Progress for each of the fiscal years 1963 through 1966. This amendment would reduce the authorization from \$600 million to \$450 million, a cut of \$150 million.

Equally as important, it would attempt to bring this fast blossoming program under a measure of control by limiting the authorization to fiscal 1964.

It would also cut the economic grant money to \$50 million for the fiscal year, a reduction of \$50 million in this authorization.

With expenditures in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 relatively small in the three categories of economic grants, social progress trust fund, and development loans, and with a carryover of approximately \$1 billion, it is my contention that with the \$150 million reduction there will be more than ample financing available for this program.

I want to reemphasize that there is already such a proliferation of funds in the Alliance for Progress program as to raise serious questions as to their justification and use.

Aside from the money involved, it is scarcely necessary to remind the House that this Government has met with but little success in obtaining the governmental reforms in Latin America that will produce a climate favorable to the investment of either public or private funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would cite to you the example of Brazil. Brazil came in last year and got \$80 million and a promise of \$398.5 million. They have not carried out the governmental reforms they promised this country they would carry out. As a matter of fact, Brazil wanted the first bite of \$80 million in a hurry to meet their payments on the loans and credits that they had been extended by Russia and other nations of the Soviet bloc; in other words, using our money to pay off the maturing obligations to the Communists.

Argentina has been the beneficiary of the Alliance for Progress and other funds—Argentina where they obtained more gold or almost as much gold in 1 recent year as we gave them in aid.

It is time to tighten the strings on the Alliance for Progress. This money is not

needed and this fund can well be drawn down and we can save another \$150 million in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for certain amendments to these foreign aid authorization bills. I think, however, if we are going to cut anywhere in this program, we must not cut in the Alliance for Progress.

Look at it from any standpoint you wish, and I think you are going to have to conclude that Latin America is not only closer to us but is more indispensable to us and to our future than any other part of the world.

Look at it from the standpoint of our military security. The missile age has not reduced but, rather, it has dramatically accentuated the need for hemispheric solidarity.

Look at it from the standpoint, if you wish, of economy. The 20 Republics of Latin America buy more of our American goods and provide for us and our economy more of the essential strategic materials necessary for the operation of our economy than does any other regional grouping in the world.

If the nations of Europe should, heaven forbid, incestuously draw inward in economic isolation, then our only natural outlet for markets would be in the direction of an awakening and expanding economy to the south of us.

Or, we can look at it, if you please, from the standpoint of our obligation. This hemisphere is our special responsibility. Charity begins at home, though it need not end there. But he who does not provide for his own, we are told, is worse than an infidel.

Or, perhaps you would like to look at it from the standpoint of the future. The nations of Latin America have the fastest growing population in the world. Today there are 200 million people in those nations. By 1975 there are going to be 300 million people. By the end of this century there will be 600 million people in the land that lies south of us, bigger than the United States and Canada put together. This is the wave of the future. This is the place where perhaps within the next 10 years the decisive battle of the cold war may well be fought.

Latin America today is a seething caldron of keyed-up emotions, long-spent-up hopes, and long-smothered aspirations gasping for air. It is a combustible combination.

We lost Cuba because the people of that unhappy island had completely lost hope of ever achieving their legitimate objectives through the slow and orderly processes of evolutionary government.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend my friend on his fine statement, but since he mentioned Cuba, I think it might be well at this stage to point out that the Soviet Union is estimated to be spending something like \$400 million a year in Cuba. Are we unwilling to spend less than half

of that much after making a commitment in the rest of South America?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. Certainly in good conscience and intelligent self-interest we can do no less than we have pledged. After generations of inattention toward our southern neighbors in the priorities of our international commitments, finally at long last the Alliance for Progress has raised some hopes and raised some expectations and has staved off the hands of futility and despair. But now are we to dash those hopes after having raised them?

Yes, admittedly the Alliance for Progress has been a little slow in getting off the ground. It took some time for us to convince Latin American leaders that we meant it when we said that this has to be a cooperative effort in which they too have to do certain things.

But in the hearings on this bill it is revealed that 11 of those countries now have done those very things we said they should do. They have reformed their tax structures. They are reforming their land tenure acts. At last they are making it possible for the "plain vanilla" fellow out on the streets or on the land to see some hope for him and his children on down the road.

Are we going to dash that hope? Now, having set our hand to the plow, are we going to turn back and say, "We did not really mean it? Now that you have done your part of the bargain, we are going to welsh on ours?"

Are we going to cut off this thing that we told them was going to be a 10-year cooperative program and say that, "We are going to give you only 1 year" and that at a cut rate? I think not. I think the American people want us not to. The stakes are too high. Latin America is too important. The Alliance for Progress is a good program. We can win this fight. We must win it. And we will not win it by throwing in the towel.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. It would reduce the authorization for the Alliance for Progress by \$150 million for fiscal year 1964. In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 the Congress authorized \$600 million for each of fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. Although the committee did not authorize carrying forward the unused authorization of \$75 million from fiscal year 1963, the committee made it clear that the people of Latin America should be assured of the confidence of the United States in the basic objectives and purpose of the Alliance. The adoption of this amendment would jeopardize the program which we authorized last year.

Mr. Chairman, impatience with the Alliance for Progress is apparent in some of the committee hearings on the foreign aid program. No one contends that the Alliance has brought a millennium to Latin America. But the program does

not merit a lack of confidence on the part of Congress, to be demonstrated by a slash in funds.

In assessing the achievements or failures of the Alliance to date, any fair evaluation must take into account a number of factors. First, an international program designed to restructure rigid societies—frozen in centuries-old patterns—is itself experimental, following an uncharted course. Hence, some trial and error should be expected.

Second, the lack of trained personnel and no clear knowledge of available resources are great obstacles to modernization. These deficiencies—which did not exist in Europe at the time of the Marshall plan—are bound to hinder the rapid transformations we hope to see in the region.

Third, the attitude on the part of great masses of the Latin American people is itself an inhibiting factor to achieving Alliance for Progress goals. After centuries of empty promises, neglect, and venal administrations, the Latin American people frequently distrust their own governments. This cynicism nullifies the creative energy of the people. Unless overcome, it prevents their enthusiastic participation in efforts to help themselves.

Fourth, the backlog in Latin America of housing, school, potable water, and other requirements for a decent life is staggering. Existing housing shortages are estimated in the millions, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of dwellings necessary each year to accommodate new family formations. Over half the children in the 7 to 14 age bracket are not in school. Over 100 million people are without adequate water supplies.

Critics of the Alliance for Progress stress the program's weaknesses. Yet there have been a number of promising developments in the last year.

It is true that the program got off to a disappointingly slow start. Many of the governments who signed the Charter of Punta del Este took their commitments for self-help lightly. A number of governments thought that all they had to do to qualify for assistance was to plead necessity or the threat of communism. Some made gestures toward self-help reforms.

In the past year Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and his aids have increasingly got the message across that something more than token or paper reforms are required. Convincing the Latin Americans that the key to sound economic and social development lies in their own self-help is of major importance in achieving the goals of the Alliance.

The 140,000 houses and 8,200 classrooms constructed under Alliance aegis in 2 years, the 700 community water systems and wells installed, the 160,000 loans to small farmers, and the increase of income tax receipts by 15 percent last year may seem like slow progress measured against the region's needs. But the Alliance is registering some remarkable accomplishments.

For the fact is that the Alliance is taking root in Latin America. It is changing attitudes in Latin America toward

the United States, toward communism, toward private enterprise, and toward change itself.

Under the Alliance for Progress the United States has associated itself with the long-continuing Latin American desire for improved economic and social progress. This association has removed much of the bitterness which marked United States-Latin American relations in the past. The United States has even moved ahead of some Latin American thinking by emphasizing social change as a concomitant of economic change.

Meanwhile, rightest elements in Latin America—frequently concentrated in the ruling few—are themselves becoming more amenable to change. Although many still resist, others are becoming convinced of the wisdom of President Kennedy's remark that "those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." Now that the Alliance for Progress exists, backed by our insistence on internal reforms, there is a growing inclination on the part of the more conservative groups in Latin America to accept evolutionary change.

With the United States urging reforms and Latin America's own conservative elements becoming less obstructionist, the belief among many Latin Americans that change is only possible through violent upheaval is receding.

The psychological impact of providing Latin America with an alternative to revolution and communism is apparent in recent developments in the Latin American student movements, ever a barometer of popular feeling. The student body of Mexico's National University, for instance, elected a liberal-moderate slate in the November elections replacing the Communist-dominated student council.

In the University of Cordoba in Argentina, moderate anti-Communist student groups are now in the majority in the student council, once controlled by Communists.

In Chile the Christian-Democratic students obtained virtual control of all commercial, secondary, and university student organizations.

In the University of Honduras anti-Communist students won a substantial victory over the Communist-dominated student organization.

This is not to say that the Alliance for Progress alone is responsible for the changing Latin American student picture. Soviet and Cuban actions, as well as the rift between the Soviet Union and China, no doubt have contributed to a weakening of Communist appeal.

Nevertheless, the Alliance for Progress is a powerful constructive influence. With its thrust toward social reforms and the encouragement by the United States of such reforms, the Alliance at once erases past misgivings about the United States and its dollar diplomacy, while at the same time creating an alternate solution to Latin America's pressing problems.

In walking the tightrope between insisting on the self-help criteria inherent in the Charter of Punta del Este—and incensing the Latin American sensitivities by intervening in their domestic

affairs—the Alliance for Progress has a difficult task.

Mr. Chairman, the road ahead is long, tough, and largely unpredictable. The experience of the last 2 years has better defined the difficulties in stirring the stagnant economies in Latin America toward self-sustaining growth.

But the obstacles must not deter us from pressing ahead with the program.

The men and women who have the day-to-day job of coping with the setbacks and the disappointments, along with the occasional resounding successes, deserve Congress most ardent support.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 10, immediately after line 10, insert the following:

"(c) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"In order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 251, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the loan funds appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, respectively, shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment is identical in language to that which was offered to the Development Loan Fund but that this now applies to the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. ADAIR. That is true. I think I can be brief in explaining this amendment. This is the second of three private enterprise amendments which I have. It is the companion to the one which the committee adopted yesterday which provides that 50 percent of the Development Loan Funds shall be used for purposes of private enterprise. Simply put that is it.

As I pointed out yesterday when the committee adopted the amendment to the Development Loan Fund section of the bill, this is in the broadest possible terms. It gives the AID administration great flexibility. The 50 percent is not measured in terms of individual countries but in terms of the program as a whole.

In this case I would agree with the gentleman from Texas who just preceded me, that one of the things we are seeking to do is to build a strong private sector of the economy in Latin America. I believe that this will contribute to that effort.

The main thrust of the amendment adopted yesterday would be in the direction of the countries of the continents of Asia, Africa, and Europe. This would apply to Latin America.

I repeat, the committee adopted a similar amendment yesterday and I should hope that the committee will adopt this one today.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague on this amendment and state that while I am not an authority on the affairs of South America I have had some experience there. I think this is a sorely needed policy direction from the Congress in this area.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday there is no Member of this House for whom I have a higher regard than I have for my colleague from Indiana. For that reason I hesitate to oppose his amendment.

I hate to oppose it for another reason, because I know what he wants to accomplish by it is the same thing I would like to see accomplished. I know his intentions are well grounded and I know that he wants to do the thing that he said, which is to channel as much of this as possible into the private sector. I do not mind telling the members of the committee that I have been less than optimistic about the Alliance for Progress program. I believe in it. I believe in its concept. But I have been less than optimistic about its success because of the fact that until we can get the big-business people, the people of wealth in Latin America to believe in their own countries and to invest their own money in Latin America, it seems to me we cannot have much chance of salvaging a successful free enterprise there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with the amendment as I see it? The one thing that bothers me about it is this: By putting this rigidity into it, by taking from the Administrator any flexibility, we might force him to face up to one of two things. Either do not put any money in a country and write it off, or if he puts money into that country, put half of it into the so-called private sector and give it to the very people who are channeling and funneling the money out of Latin America into numbered accounts in Swiss banks.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], will admit that we have impressed upon these people that we want this done. We have told them we want it done. But I really believe that the gentleman from Indiana would not want the Administrator to be faced with the Hobson's choice that I have mentioned.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In response to the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio. I would say that I am certain that the committee has impressed upon the Administrator and his immediate associates and aids the fact that we are concerned about the private sector. I would differ

with the gentleman as to the fact that we are tying his hands too tightly. I think the amendment does give him a very great degree of flexibility.

Mr. HAYS. Except, may I say to the gentleman, if you interpret the amendment strictly—and I see no other way to interpret it if he puts any money in at all—is to put half of it into the private sector. Now, presuming that he cannot find in some country a private business in which he has confidence? Then he is faced with the choice of putting in no money at all. This is one danger I see to it. I think they are going to do this in the extent feasible. But I do not like the idea of tying his hands.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman has made the argument that was made in the committee many times when this amendment was offered in committee. The principal objection that I saw to the amendment was that in the long run this could create a bigger burden for the American taxpayer. What the AID has been trying to do is to bring as many countries as possible into this program on a multilateral basis on many of these public projects. If the free enterprise sector could siphon off the cream of these projects where there is going to be a return, we would find that these other countries would not join in the multilateral agreements which we have been seeking in order to create wider participation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment and the amendment that we adopted yesterday would possibly create a greater burden on the American taxpayers.

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman this: We have the amendment which was adopted yesterday. I would like to see this one defeated and let the program work with the amendment in one sector and without it in the other. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that next year, if his amendment works the way he thinks it will, I will be one of the first ones in here supporting it. But I do not think we ought to make the program so rigid that we have no alternative but to either grant the money to people about whom we have doubts or grant no money at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer in the system of private enterprise in Latin America, just as is the gentleman from Indiana. I supported last year and joined in sponsoring the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], to try to concentrate more of the effort in this program along those lines in order to try, with this program, to stimulate individual enterprise, small business, and small farmers in their efforts to become self-sustaining. But I want to point out two things that we are going to do which I think are very undesirable if we adopt this amendment in the case of Latin America.

In the first place, one of the real propaganda battles we are having to fight in Latin America is the Castro charge that the United States aid programs are designed to help the wealthy and to help those who are in power in Latin America; that they do not reach the people themselves. If we say we have to channel 50 percent of our aid into the private business sector, you can bet your bottom dollar there are going to be a lot of people alleging that a big portion of this aid is going to the big banks and the big businesses of Latin America and will be channeled through them.

Why is that important, and why is it dangerous to this program? The State Department has published a booklet entitled "Building on Experience." That booklet contains this statement about your housing program in Latin America:

In most of the less developed countries, the only way to own a home is to pay cash or borrow the money at high interest rates (20 percent per year and up) to be repaid within 3 or 4 years at the most. The result is to put home ownership beyond reach of all but the wealthy.

If we adopt the amendment we will say in effect that at least half of our program in housing, for example, in Latin America, is going to be channeled through private lending organizations that are levying this kind of interest and requiring short-term repayment of these loans, and we are going to freeze the situation as it stands right now where they are not able to build homes and get home ownership money for your low income and medium income people in Latin America.

I believe home ownership is the foundation of a society that wants to resist communism. I am a firm believer that you strike a basic blow for private enterprise when you provide an opportunity for the average citizen to borrow money and use that money to develop a business, to farm his own land, or to build a home.

Mr. Chairman, unless we are able to get some change in the lending practices of large segments of the private industry sector in Latin America, and nobody knows that we can do it, we are going to tie the hands of the Administrator in a most undesirable way. I hope we do not play into the hands of the Castro group by tying this amendment to our efforts in South America.

I hope you will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio and defeat this amendment on the Alliance for Progress approach in Latin America. In that way we certainly take out of the hands of the Castro group one of the most damaging propaganda weapons against the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I want to be entirely certain that the gentleman understands this amendment. It does not say that 50 percent of any particular project nor 50 percent of the funds in any country, but 50 percent of the program as a whole.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do understand that point, and I am sympathetic with

your overall objective, but I am afraid it is going to be misconstrued and misrepresented all over Latin America. For another thing, it operates in many countries to the disadvantage of the Administrator in carrying on an effective program. With all regard in the world for the gentleman's objective and the worthwhile desire he has in attempting to improve the private sector and the economy down there, I do not think we ought to paint ourselves into that corner and tie the hands of the Administrator in South America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk here by the two gentlemen who preceded me about this money going into the hands of private individuals and going into Swiss banks and numbered accounts.

I might call to the attention of the House the fact that some of this money obviously has been going into the hands of government officials as well. When you take the history of individuals and the history of government officials in Latin America, with the Batistas, the Perons, and Jimenezes, and a lot of others, it seems to me the story is just as black on that side as it is on the private sector.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was not this entire Alliance for Progress program originally sold to the Congress on the basis that it would create a favorable climate in South and Central America for private investment?

Mr. WESTLAND. I just do not think there is any guarantee that if we spend a billion dollars or 20 billion dollars and put the money in the hands of government officials in Latin America it necessarily is going to get into the economy proper.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The thing I am saying is that the Administrator has to the best of his ability to try to determine that whichever one he makes a loan to is reasonably honest and is reasonably likely to let the money stay in the country and do something for the people of the country.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would agree with that. I think the private industrialist in South America is just as honest as any government official down there.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further; yes, we helped Dictator Batista of Cuba, not under the Alliance for Progress, but with economic and military assistance. We helped Batista, and what did we get? Castro.

This is all too often the result when we support governments that are in fact ruled by the military. This is why millions and billions of our dollars have gone down the drain and the present policies of this administration mean that more will go the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAIR and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 159.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for his patience, forbearance, and kindness during the long and involved hearings, and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] for her patience in dealing with the new members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, if I had been a Member of Congress when the Marshall plan was considered, a plan to help rebuild and reconstruct the cities and industries of our allies in World War II, I would have supported the plan. When the program changed to the technical assistance program—the point 4 operation—perhaps the warning flag would have been raised. Yet since this was an effort by the United States to share its technical knowledge and know-how with friendly countries of the world it too had merit and would have received my support.

Unfortunately, at times our great Foreign Affairs Committee is referred to as an international public works committee. This, of course, is unkind, yet one merely has to examine the bill and it is hard to come to any other conclusion. In examining our efforts in the field of foreign assistance, particularly on the economic side, we find some unexplainable and serious deficiencies. For example, we find that in some of the recipient countries, their tax laws are such that they are not making an attempt to help themselves; that they would prefer to look to the United States for aid and until we get realistic and insist upon reforms and self-help we shall continue to be referred to as "Uncle Sugar."

Indeed the land reforms that are needed in some countries would aid the depressed and give self-respect to those who wanted to achieve change. Yet such reforms are not forthcoming.

There was a book published recently by D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., called "The Achieving Society" and it was written by David C. McClelland, of Harvard University. The book really is a textbook on sociology which has as its main premise the theory that until a person or a people want a change and want to improve their conditions that all the aid and money in the world will be of no benefit. The desire must be more than in the minds of men and their leaders, but it must also be in their actions. The will must be there. They must be willing to help themselves.

On Tuesday we heard a very excellent discussion by our colleague, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. PIKE], who quoted a saying he had read on the wall of one of the superintendents of schools in his district. Whoever had reproduced the quote changed the most important part. The quote comes from Dante's "Inferno" and reads:

The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crises, maintain their neutrality.

Mr. PIKE used his quotation for examining his own conscience and I will use Dante's to examine the action of some nation's who remain neutral or at least in theory remain neutral. We find some who play the great game of trying to stay in the middle in the fight between East and West and try to gain from both a special advantage. Our policy seems to be that these people should not have to make a choice, and to keep them in the middle is a good thing. I cannot agree with this premise for should the time ever come when they have to make a choice I would like to know which side of the middle they would be inclined to jump.

We give aid to Communist countries with the thought in mind that we are going to win them from the Communist bloc. We insist that our goal in world affairs is nothing more than wanting self-determination for all peoples of the world; yet by our aid and our actions we help keep a dictator like Tito in power in Yugoslavia. This to me is totally inconsistent.

In comparing our situation today to what it was at the end of World War II and considering the billions of dollars that have been spent through various foreign aid programs, one could almost come to the mathematical certainty that the more dollars that are spent around the world, the more precarious our position becomes. It would appear that we become inconsistent in our purpose and direction.

It is no secret that this country is heavily in debt and that the tax burden that our people have to bear is very substantial. We also find by comparison that some of the European countries who received Marshall plan aid and who have made phenomenal recoveries economically do not pay their fair share of the cost of financing programs and development in the underdeveloped countries of the world or the newly emerging nations. We also find that in the countries that they do aid they have direct ties and conditions upon which the aid is given. Could it be that their view of an aid program is directly related to their own economic well-being?

We heard yesterday that our grant programs were gradually being changed to loan programs and that this was a step in the right direction. I personally believe that this leaves the wrong impression with some Members of Congress and certainly with the people of the country who understand that a loan must be repaid. Part of our loan program requires a repayment in local currency of the recipient country or soft currency, but the repayment agreement has a further restriction that this money must be respent in the recipient country by the United States to finance other

programs for the benefit of that country, and that we can spend a small portion of it for financing our embassy operations and for other purposes, so long as that money does not leave the country. It, therefore, might be repaid in a sense of the word, but it will never find its way back to the U.S. Treasury to ease the burden of the American taxpayer.

We also find that we are going to have to borrow a substantial amount of money at about 4½ percent interest to loan to a foreign power at three-fourths of 1 percent interest, who in turn will loan it to an entity within that country to build a plant and the loan from the foreign power will draw 5¾ percent interest. The foreign power will make 5 percent on the transaction, while this country will lose 3¾ percent. Again, this is carrying generosity a little bit too far.

It was suggested yesterday during the debate what a terrible thing it would be to scrap this program and turn our back on our allies and friends around the world and leave them to the onslaught of communism. Such a suggestion is not only unwarranted, but a little bit degrading. We never have, in our history, turned our back on people in need. We have given aid to those who needed it, but we have not always used the shotgun approach that we are using at the present time.

It has always appeared a strange practice to me to include both the economic assistance with the military in one bill, instead of giving them separately to the House, which to me would be a better practice.

I think through the years we have proven that we cannot buy friends with dollars. Yet we continue with our dollar diplomacy. We confuse our allies and unfortunately tend to mislead the American taxpayer.

We must indeed examine our position and we must be prepared to vote and then under our system explain our vote to the people back home. I for one will not remain neutral, for to me it is morally wrong to ask the American people to make increasing sacrifices to finance the operation of governments who have done little or nothing to help themselves or to give aid to Communist dominated countries under the guise of trying to win their friendship.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment later in the bill which will deal specifically with our allies and friends who continue to do business with Cuba by allowing their ships to trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment in the appropriations bill last year which we thought would do the job but it was not successful. The purpose of my amendment, which I shall discuss further under the 5-minute rule, is to deal specifically with the problem of ships in the registry of any country which receives either economic or military aid from the United States. It is about time some of our friends in the world who claim to be our allies, and who are not by any stretch of the imagination to be considered neutral—to change their policy and stop allowing ships of their registry to trade with Communist Cuba. It is a direct viola-

tion of our President's stated policy of an economic blockade of Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman on his announced intention to introduce an amendment which would deal with and stop shipping by free world nations to Cuba. I have drafted a similar amendment and am hopeful Congress will put an end to our aiding countries that continue to do business with Communist Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out "1963" and "\$148,900,000" and substituting "1964" and "\$136,050,000", respectively.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 10, lines 16 and 17, strike out "\$136,050,000" and substitute "\$120,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get an amendment that my friend from Ohio, Mr. HAYS, can support. I am trying to get one down to his size if that is possible. I am going down this time to \$16 million—only \$16 million. I would hope I could get a little help from the gentleman, because the next one that I introduce is going to be considerably higher in terms of cutting the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. I just want to encourage the gentleman. If you keep trying, I am going to come with you.

Mr. GROSS. I will be right here.

This amendment in comparison with others that has been and will be offered provides for the relatively small cut of \$16,050,000 in the funds contributed by the United States to international organizations for various and sundry purposes. The administration has requested \$136 million for this purpose for fiscal 1964. Get this. The administration requested \$136 million for this purpose, and estimated its expenditures at \$127 million. So it wanted a nice little cushion somewhere along the line. I contend that \$120 million together with an estimated carryover of \$74 million is more than adequate to meet all the U.S. commitments to these international organizations in fiscal 1964.

Incidentally, these expenditures are in addition to approximately \$85 million contributed by the United States as its share of the expenses of international organizations. Nor does this take into account the financing of the Peace Corps, which also presumably provides technical assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to belabor the issue. I think it is clear cut. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. AVERY. As I listened to the gentleman explain his amendment, I was reminded of the fact that I think it was last April the press carried a story that a subsidiary organization of the United Nations had made allocations to Cuba for an economic survey as it related to their agricultural production. Does the gentleman recall the incident I am referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. AVERY. Is this the title of the bill that would make a contribution to such international organizations as made the allocation to Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. As I understand it, this includes the United Nations special fund.

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will yield further, as I recall it, the United States is contributing about 40 percent to that particular organization.

Mr. GROSS. I think that is right.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I also want to be fair. Does not this section bar any contributions to Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid that amendment was watered down to the point where I doubt that it will do what the chairman thinks it will do.

Mr. MORGAN. I call the gentleman's attention to page 13 of the bill, line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask, particularly the gentlewoman from Ohio who I know has firsthand experience and information on this subject, this question. This section covers, does it not, the so-called contribution to the Palestine refugees? And if I am correct in this, then may I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a problem which is at the core of the whole problem in the Middle East. We will never get peace in the Middle East, I think it is fair to say, until we find a solution to the Palestine refugee problem. I feel rather strongly that inasmuch as—I think again I am right—we are giving 70 percent of that fund here in the United States, it is time that we looked somewhere for its more effective use. We may have to drive a bargain to solve this admittedly very difficult but nevertheless important problem if we are not to have a tinder box in the Middle East.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Ohio if she does not agree that perhaps we should do something, and I hope through this committee, to step up a solution to that Palestine refugee problem.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman has put before us one of the problems that has been brought up for many years, and if we could find a solution to it, that would be quite marvelous. I was on that committee; I am not now and have not been for some years and I am not as well versed in the details as

I used to be. But I feel that in reality this will have to be straightened out between the two factions. We cannot go in and say, "You must do this or that." We have done altogether too much of that all over the world. I hope that a solution will be found because I agree with the gentleman that it is a most important matter—the peace of mankind.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentlewoman. May I also point out that unless you indicate in some way that you are not going to support people forever on a dole, as these people have been for 15 years, it seems to me somewhere along the line we should say—not 70 percent, maybe 50 percent—something that would indicate some urgency that they arrive at a solution.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how the Palestine refugee question can be determined for quite a few years. Unfortunately, the Arab countries are intransigent as far as that matter is concerned. I have recommended to the State Department that we should gradually reduce the amount of money that is being turned over to the organization that is taking care of these refugees in order that they may be made to realize that there must eventually come a termination to this problem. Unfortunately, not enough of them are being educated so that they can go out on their own and earn a living. But I learned this year that the State Department, in reply to a report that I wrote after going to the area—that they are beginning to reduce the amount that is being turned over to the refugee organization for the purpose of maintenance and support. I was advised that 5 percent of the money will be used for the purpose of educating the refugees and teaching them trades so that they can go out into the other Arab countries and earn a livelihood. The intention of the State Department, in my opinion, is a good one. Of course, it is a belabored one.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very difficult problem. I do not see how they can possibly dispose of it shortly. There are too many questions that are raised with relation to the question. There is no simple answer. Nevertheless, I do think that we have made a start toward disposing of the question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who created this refugee situation, this camp of a million displaced persons in the Middle East? Who created it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it was created, as the gentleman knows, at the time of the so-called creation of the State of Israel.

Mr. GROSS. Who created it? Was it not created by the United Nations?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was created in conjunction with the United Nations and the United States was the first nation to recognize the new State of Israel.

Mr. GROSS. Why does the United Nations not take care of it, then?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They are. But the most important part, financially at least, of the United Nations happens to be us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the international organization authorization of the mutual security bill has always been approved 100 percent both in the authorization and in the appropriation. Last year we authorized and appropriated approximately \$148 million. This year it is \$136 million. These are amounts that have been pledged to finance programs adopted by the organizations concerned. This includes the Children's Fund, it includes the U.N. technical assistance program and special fund, the U.N. food and agricultural program, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization, the NATO science program, and other programs.

Mr. Chairman, these are amounts agreed to by the representatives of the member nations. Even though the cut which has been offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], is a modest one, it is still going to make us shortchange some of the pledges to which we have already committed ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Page 10, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"Sec. 107. Section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general authority to make contributions to international organizations, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(b) Contributions, whether in cash or in goods and services, and other payments made by the United States for the calendar year 1964 or any subsequent calendar year to the United Nations or to any program or activity thereof (whether or not financed, in whole or in part by assessments against member nations) may not exceed 33.33 percent of the total amount contributed and paid by all nations for the calendar year involved to the United Nations, or the program or activity thereof, as the case may be."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment to be noncontroversial except for those with pets and penchants; that is, the intent is simply to collate all U.S. spending to our second foreign aid program via the United Nations; and to delineate and clarify for, first, our U.N. Ambassador, second, the

director of the nonbudgeted extra and additional programs established by the U.N. parent organization, and third, our State Department, the legislative intent of this Congress. In so doing we will quite properly assume our prerogative of limiting the executive branch, namely, the State Department, in their propensity for and dispersal of, our taxpayers' moneys.

As read by the Clerk, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would clarify our original intent. Broadly this would limit U.S. contributions to the budget of all organizations developed and devised by that body to our currently established—Public Law 82-495—maximum share of the regular—assessed—U.N. budget, which is 33½ percent. We are now paying 32.02 percent and I propose that this same limit be applied to all U.N. assistance agencies to whom we voluntarily contribute through the U.N. or AID, and that all hands comply therewith.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 days' CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in a letter to all Members, plus appearance before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and many reports to this House the first 3 months of this year; and as a result of research into the U.N. diverse funds situation, I have pointed out that we contribute in excess of 33½ percent to 10 of the 28 U.N. budgets. I submitted to each of you a table indicating the savings that would accrue if this amendment had been in effect in 1962. It would have amounted to approximately \$38 million, and it is estimated that based on the budget for 1964 it could amount to \$50 million.

American taxpayers now finance the U.N.'s myriad budgets and funds in widely varying amounts—often at the discretion of the State Department or by virtue of their wiles in interpreting through implementation, counsel, and regulation our legislative efforts.

We pay 40 percent of the Special Fund by special legislation. The same applies to the extended technical assistance program. Seventy percent of the U.N. relief and works agency in the Near East, and 100 percent to the WHO community water development and research programs. I am certain there are those representing special interest groups who will claim that by offering this amendment we do not love little children. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I submit that when we pay, and will continue to pay—33½ percent of the costs of UNESCO, UNICEF, and refugee relief in the Near East we are doing more than our fair share. Besides they have their own fundraising activities, in addition. Actually, we have been paying the same disproportionate share of the U.N. Special Fund and ETAP since 1959. We have paid 100 percent of two WHO projects since 1959, without encouraging any participation by anyone, excepting benefits. Our share of the U.N. Palestine refugee relief program has, in fact, increased from 67.48 percent in 1949 to its present alltime high of 70 percent. As a physician, humanitarian, congressional adviser to WHO, and one continually interested in the United Nations, I do not decry the merit of these works, or even our excessive expenditure to get

them on the road. However, I maintain that it is extremely important for us to let these people develop their own resources and build souls of steel, as we did after the Declaration of Independence, instead of feet of clay.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, with the prosperity evidenced in recent years, and the participation of a hundred nations in these programs through U.N.—including all the Communist and so-called neutralist countries—we could logically expect them to pick up the burden more rapidly. Aside from the relative merit of these multilateral programs, they are not nearly so international in cost, as they are in benefits. Nor has our increasing contribution to them resulted in any reduction of our foreign aid program. As I indicated yesterday, nations will have the Santa Claus complex as long as we act the role of the giver, which is about to play out due to our own domestic indebtedness, gold outflow, and imbalance of payments.

In the case of the special fund and ETAP I have previously documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD examples of substantial aid to Communist bloc countries. Total U.N. aid to, or program for, the Red bloc in 1963-64 includes 16 projects for Cuba, 30 projects for Poland, 30 projects for Yugoslavia, 3 projects for Albania, and 12 interregional projects with Red nations involved—a total of 93 projects costing \$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union contributes no more to the special fund now than she did in 1959. Her pledge each year is for \$1 million—less than the contribution of tiny Switzerland—yet the U.S. contribution to the special fund has grown from \$10 million in 1959 to \$29 million in 1963. This is an increase of almost 300 percent. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Red-bloc contributions are in nonconvertible currencies.

Mr. Chairman, if benefiting or recipient nations do not criticize Russia for paying less than its fair share, no nation can criticize us for not paying more than one-third of the world budget, which is well beyond our fair share. I hope all Members will support this amendment to establish a fair and limiting ceiling on all U.S. contributions to the United Nations assistance budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intend his amendment to have application to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations?

Mr. HALL. It would. It already applies to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations; they are in the budgeted programs of the United Nations, to which the Congress intended in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that the 33½ percent apply.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with that. Insofar as voluntary contributions of the peacekeeping functions; would the gentleman's amendment apply?

Mr. HALL. It would apply to all voluntary funds—yes; under the amendment as written, that is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I think, perhaps, the gentleman may be in error because there is a difference between housekeeping and peacekeeping. There is a restriction of 33½ percent as to the housekeeping funds of the United Nations and that is so far as salaries and buildings and things of that nature, meetings of staff officers and so forth. But on the peacekeeping voluntary phase of it, there is no such restriction.

Mr. HALL. I think I made it quite clear that I intended it to apply there.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee just turned down one amendment to cut funds in this program and the pending amendment is another method of cutting the funds. I would hope the Committee would act with respect to cutting percentages in the same way it did with respect to the proposed cut in authorized funds.

Let me say this first. A question came up in the earlier discussion about Cuba. There is an amendment in the bill now on page 13 which I sponsored which reads as follows:

No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contribution to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

So there should be no further question in your mind about voluntary contributions to the U.N. on Cuban projects.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the pending amendment of fixing a ceiling of 33½ percent on all voluntary contributions, I was very pleased to hear the sponsor of the amendment say that he does not question nor is he opposed to any of the work being performed by any of the agencies of the United Nations. The United States is trying to get more firmly established and to get other nations organized into multilateral effort for training and development in projects. This is the very reason the Congress has given the administration the flexibility in providing for voluntary contribution over and above the percentages for regular assessments.

We have certain specific limitations in the law now. Under proper study by this committee and by this House we have fixed a limitation of 40 percent on the special fund and the expanded technical assistance fund. But the sponsor of this amendment does not make a case that voluntary contributions are getting out of hand. Let me respectfully show you these facts. In the United Nations Children's Fund, for example, we started U.S. contributions at 71.55 percent and we are now down to 40 percent. In the United Nations expanded technical assistance program we started at 59.93 percent and we are down to 40 percent. In the World Health Organization we started out at 100 percent, but that program was absorbed into the regular budget and we now pay 31.12 percent on that particular program.

I could go on, but the point I am making is that the administrators of this program under both recent administrations have worked very diligently under

the scrutiny of both the Committee on Appropriations and the Foreign Affairs Committee to scale down our voluntary contributions to these U.N. programs. They have a good record. There is no reason, therefore, to arbitrarily apply the same percentage to all U.N. programs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. On the peacekeeping operations, would not this amendment in effect give the Soviets a veto over our putting money into a program that they did not like and that they refused, where the budget cannot be met and we decided to absorb a bigger share of it? If we are limited, we cannot do it. Would that not have this effect?

Mr. FASCELL. There is no question about it. The principal reason why this amendment should be defeated, as I see it, is this: The purpose is fine as far as keeping down your contributions and encouraging others to come in, but you cannot club a horse to water. You have to lead him. I respectfully submit this is what the records and statistics of these programs indicate as far as the efforts of the United States are concerned and as far as our contributions to these programs are concerned. Our records show we started out with a high percentage and over a period of time we kept scaling it down while other countries make more contributions to these multilateral programs. This is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted the gentleman to spell out the answer to the question that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays], directed to him, namely as to the veto this would give to the Soviet Union on the peacekeeping operations. I am told, had you had such a limitation, such a veto would have come about in several places in the world.

Mr. FASCELL. There is not any question about the fact that if you write a specific limitation on our voluntary contributions you are tying our hands in dealing with peacekeeping operations. In that way you do give the Soviets a veto, because they withdraw from all of these peacekeeping operations that do not suit their specific purpose.

Mr. BOGGS. And put up nothing.

Mr. FASCELL. And put up absolutely nothing. So we just play into their hands with this kind of foolishness.

I submit that our record is good. We do contribute on a percentage basis to these voluntary agencies. We started at a high rate and we have been scaling them down. So our record in this respect is good. The amount of the contributions from other nations has increased. There is no valid reason, therefore, on this score why we should now arbitrarily place an inflexible ceiling.

One more point, Mr. Chairman. Communist countries contribute to the United Nations program of technical assistance \$20.4 million. They get out of that program \$10.1 million. In other words,

they get out less than they put in. The free world countries, on the other hand, have a fine record of getting 94.97 percent of all the projects under the U.N. program of technical assistance.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman for giving us a very concise, accurate and statistical analysis of the various funds that go to make up our entire United Nations picture. I would like to ask him if he believes that we would have gone into Korea if there had been such a limitation on the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

Mr. FASCELL. It would be more difficult to obtain functioning of U.N. peacekeeping operations if you tied the hands of the administration with a ceiling on voluntary contributions.

Mr. BARRY. Let me put the question this way. Would we not have had to go into Korea on our own rather than through the United Nations if we wanted to carry out our policy as a nation?

Mr. FASCELL. May I answer the gentleman this way. If you place this limitation on our contributions to voluntary programs in the United Nations, when we seek to initiate a peacekeeping function in the U.N. which is in the best interest of the United States, it would require us, if we are not able to do it multilaterally, to pay the entire cost ourselves.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the gentleman whether or not the refugee program in Palestine toward which we are now paying about 70 percent would not fall under this limitation, because the Arabs do not pay their proportionate share.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will permit me, he has raised a very good point. You apply the ceiling now and you apply it automatically and arbitrarily on all the existing programs.

Mr. BARRY. In other words, these programs would not be possible and would fail if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. FASCELL. I would agree that they would be injured seriously. I say that an arbitrary ceiling is a very ineffective way to deal with these particular programs. The very thing we are trying to preserve in the best interests of and to carry out the policy of the United States is our flexibility. To go in at 4 percent, if we want to, or at 70 percent, if we have to, and to work always toward trying to scale down our contribution and raise the contributions of other nations. The record indicates that this is what we have been doing. Therefore, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not only unnecessary, but is dangerous and is not in our best interests.

Mr. BARRY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and

I should like to make an observation with respect to the amount of money to be saved by this amendment. It is an absolute fact that the total contribution we make to all of the United Nations peacekeeping operations of which the Congo, for instance, was only a part, is less than the total cost to garrison only one unequipped division in West Germany. There is no economy in this. I hope the amendment is defeated.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time merely to inform the committee that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], who was just in this well, is the chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs we regard the gentleman from Florida as one of the ablest and certainly one the hardest working members of our committee. He has spent endless hours with his subcommittee in the study of the subject matter covered by the pending amendment and his remarks must be weighed as those of a thoroughly informed authority.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure members of the committee who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would wish to know the background and experience of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] in the field of the present discussion. I turn back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I certainly know his intentions in offering this amendment were of the highest. Certainly, the disposition of many Members of this body is to support the amendment. But let me say this: There is not a Member of this House who would knowingly seek to assist the Soviet Union. Conceivably, that is precisely what we will be doing by the adoption of this amendment. I know it is the furthest thing from the mind of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain just how it could happen, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has pointed out, insofar as peacekeeping operations are concerned.

The adoption of this amendment could effectively give to the Soviet Union a veto over actions which would be in the interest of the United States of America. Let us assume there was a conflict and let us assume that it is in the interest of the United States that the U.N. intervene in this conflict. Let us assume further that the U.S.S.R. opposes U.N. intervention for their own purposes. The U.S.S.R. as a matter of policy has made it plain that they will not participate in nor contribute to programs which are against their interests. Thus, if the U.S.S.R. were to refuse to contribute financially to this operation which, by hypothesis, is in the interest of the United States, and if the cost of this operation were greater than that which could be borne by the other nations, it

would be necessary for there to be a U.S. voluntary contribution in excess of 33 percent which the gentleman from Missouri suggests.

What we would be doing, gentlemen, is letting the U.S.S.R. decide American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a soul in this body who wants to do that.

I entreat the members of the committee to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute to point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and other members of the committee who spoke in opposition to this amendment, that the charge being leveled against this amendment to the effect that it would place a veto power in the hands of the Soviet Union is a very effective debate technique but obviously not a fact.

Mr. Chairman, unless I am mistaken, there are more than 100 other nations in addition to the United States and the U.S.S.R. who are members of the U.N. and most are able and I hope willing to contribute to these funds.

I repeat that even though this charge is effective debating technique it cannot be supported by either facts or logic.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take time for just 1 more minute to direct a question to the gentleman from New York. In the process of yielding to a number of Members I do not believe the gentleman from New York had an opportunity to tell the House whether he was for or against this amendment. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us now?

Mr. BARRY. I think it should be crystal clear that I am against the amendment.

I would like to ask the gentleman in the well if he can give me the name of any one major country in the world that could either afford with dollars or with military ability to pursue our national interests if the United Nations members were unable to pick up their share of the tab. Is there another country that could do it if we do not do it?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would advise the gentleman from New York there is not any country in the world that should pursue our national policy. They should pursue their own national policies. Our first obligation is to pursue our own national interests. If any U.N. program is in need of support from responsible nations it will receive it and you can quote the chairman of the House committee who listed yesterday that a number of Western European nations have the financial status to provide the needed response for U.N. funds.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Is it not true that we have the highest debt and the highest taxes of any nation in the world, that our national debt totals more than that of the entire world put together?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, and the gentleman speaks as a member of a committee that has much to do with the matter of increasing our national debt.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I think I can give you some good reasons why it should be adopted. I hope that some of my friends who I know are against the bill and who have been refraining from voting for any of the amendments to improve the bill will vote for this amendment.

I remember when I first became a Member of this House we were contributing 40 percent or more to the United Nations General Fund. I am convinced that had not Congress placed a limitation of 33.3 percent upon our contribution it would never have been reduced. In the past several years I have been recommending that we cut down the percentage amount of our contribution to some of these funds. The gentleman from New York mentioned the Palestine Refuge Fund, and many others will recall that I reported on a situation there when the United States was paying 90 percent of the cost of that program—we were paying that in dollars. On visiting that area I talked with the commission which was administering that program and I was astounded to find out they were using U.S. dollars to buy surplus wheat from Australia, Canada, France, and other countries, and were refraining from buying any of our wheat, due, they said, to the fact our price was too high.

I said at that time, and I am still convinced I am correct and that it is sound policy, at anytime that the United States is contributing as much as 50 percent to any program they had better take that program over, operate it in the most efficient manner it can, and get full credit for it, rather than contribute 50, 60, 70, or more percent to a program which is administered in a lot of countries where the United States does not get any credit at all for its contribution. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The peacekeeping operations of this program that serves the interest of the United States and all those programs coming under the "Special Programs" would bear the brunt of the pending amendment. If the United States has a certain program which would advance its cause or serve the cause of peace, we would be unable to participate in this program unless we could convince the other members of the U.N. to put up two-thirds of the money. If this amendment is adopted we would be precluded from undertaking this type of operation; therefore we would be precluded from serving the best interest of the United States through the apparatus of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union has many times criticized this procedure and has stated that the United States uses this device

as "under the umbrella of the U.N." to serve its own interests. I feel, therefore, that this amendment while it has a worthy intent would have the effect of precluding the United States from using the mechanism of the United Nations to serve the cause of peace, and we would be required to undertake unilaterally those policies that we feel are in our best interest and therefore can best be served through the United Nations.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. To the gentleman's knowledge, does he think the United States would have gone to war unilaterally in the Congo had not the United Nations gone to war in the Congo?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not know, but I think this program is designed to stabilize the peace, not encourage war. If we adopt the Hall amendment, I think we will seriously impair the best mechanism we have for peace, the United Nations.

Mr. BARRY. I should like to assure the gentleman that on firsthand knowledge I was told by the Chief Executive of the United States that had not the United Nations taken up the cudgels in the Congo operation, the United States would have had to go in unilaterally. Certainly here is a perfect example of how a 30-percent limitation would have precluded the United Nations from taking that action and would have precluded the United Nations from going into Korea. We would have had to do these things alone instead of having the moral backing and multinational assistance that in effect made the Korean war a free world struggle against international communism.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, the author of this amendment.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are some things that should be said as a result of the various remarks that have been made, predominantly on the "con" side. I also had hoped much of the effort, much of the work, and much of the research, as per the last 3 days' insertions in the RECORD would have been read and the Members would have been knowledgeable, in addition to what was said in the short 5 minutes on the amendment.

Certainly I think the gentleman from Florida would agree with me that we knew that neither the United Nations through its various 28 different funds over and above the assessed funds, had any means of auditing those funds; nor does our State Department at the present time, by their letter of admission, have any means of checking on our contributions to those. It would seem therefore that this is a much more reasonable

manner in which to limit the source of the "golden egg."

I would also say to the gentleman from Florida that we not only have contributed 100 percent to many of the World Health Organization funds, but we still contribute 100 percent to the malaria fund and the sanitary survey and water development fund that is going on at the present time.

As far as the peacekeeping operation is concerned, I think the colloquy of the last two gentlemen pretty well developed this proposition, because we did go into Lebanon unilaterally, which is very closely related to the so-called tinderbox of the world. Actually, the only veto we would be giving the Soviet by this amendment, Mr. Chairman, would be this limiting, by our own law, as to the amount we could contribute to any given U.N. situation.

As to the present situation in the Near East, the people that are refugees there are Arabs. I suggest only that Nasser, Syria, and Iraq, instead of spending millions for Russian arms, including mach 2 fighters for an attack on Israel, spend some of this money on refugees. I realize there is a dispute about the territory, and perhaps there is a question of adverse usage there involved, in that they do not want to accept them back into their own territory as refugees. But why do we have more of a responsibility to pay the cost of the Arab refugee program than we have to pay the cost of the Chinese refugee problem involving those who are coming into Hong Kong every day? How can that be part of the program when we pay 70 percent of the cost?

I should like to refer to the hearings, where the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Dr. MORGAN], had a colloquy with Mr. Cleveland of the State Department, as follows:

Dr. MORGAN. The United States has continued to carry most of the burden of supporting the Arab refugees in Palestine for a good many years. The attitude that the State Department seems to have, is that we should just accept the "status quo" and do nothing to disturb the situation. What would happen if Congress would decide to cut this U.S. contribution to the Palestine refugees to about \$10 million, and say, "Now look, we are not going to carry this burden for the rest of our lives: something has to be done."

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think the people that it would stimulate would be the Arab refugees.

I think it would stimulate them to start a turbulence in the Middle East which taken together with all the other things that are happening might really blow the place sky high.

I think this is a form of blackmail, as the gentleman from California said in one of his previous discussions, as long as we care for the Arab refugees, the Arabs in the Near East will not start a war.

Now as far as the question of the UNICEF program is concerned, I would like to point out again to the House, if the gentleman will yield further, that the funds for this are raised through voluntary fundraising as well as our own

compulsory tax efforts. All who wish to support this worthy purpose can sit down and write a check just as they do for their own community chest. We raised billions of dollars in this country through voluntary charitable contributions by means of this route. This does much more for the giver than does charity given by compulsion. Incidentally, it is also tax deductible.

Then I would like to say further about the special project of UNESCO for the preservation of the ancient Nubian monuments in Mr. Nasser's land—the United Arab Republic—see page 1514 of hearings. In 1961 we paid 66.49 percent. A call to the Department of State just this week revealed that "our percentage for 1962 has still not been determined, because the contributions from other countries are not complete."

CONGO SITUATION

It is true, the Clay Committee did recommend an exception in the case of the Congo. But this operation is being phased out in regard to troops. In fact, Ambassador Stevenson earlier this year warned that we were only going to pay our proportionate share. Since that time, in typical fashion, we have "backtracked."

PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF ETAP AND SPECIAL FUND

Mr. Cleveland's argument before the committee was, that not all 110 nations are participating in Special Fund and ETAP. Only about 90—of which 60 are labeled "underdeveloped," and 30 are "developed." That is why he says we pay more than our 33 1/3 percent. It is not a valid argument. If fewer countries are participating, the budget should be lower, but our proportionate share should be the same. Russia is one of the so-called developed countries. Yet she gives only \$1 million to the Special Fund, and has been giving the same amount since 1959. We started out with \$10 million and are now up to \$30 million—300 percent increase.

Also, Mr. Chairman, comparisons with what Communist blocs get to what free world gets are not valid. Included in the so-called free world countries are Ghana, British Guiana, Indonesia, and numerous other neutralists who are not neutralists at all. It is incorrect to label them "free world." Also, I raise the question of Russian subscriptions in non-convertible currencies.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we finally have the explanation for the Sphinx's inscrutable smile. It is not the sands of the Nile, but it is the fact that we are genial jackasses, as one of the other gentlemen says, without our taxpayers' money from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment passes.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his very excellent contribution toward the clarification of his amendment. It is a good amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HALL and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 157, noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 18:

"CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out '1963' and '\$415,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '\$380,000,000', respectively.

"CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

"SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out '1963' and '\$300,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '1964' and '\$200,000,000', respectively.

"SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 11, line 2, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents you with an opportunity to take one small step toward improving the administration of this fund and greater self-discipline so badly needed in this program. I want to direct your attention to the fact that the contingency fund is not the only cookie jar in which the President has complete discretion to disburse the cookies, because the Clerk just read the preceding section relating to supporting assistance. The section on supporting assistance carries \$380 million and no amendment has been offered to alter that amount.

The section on the contingency fund carries \$200 million additional for a total amount of \$580 million. That is solely in the hands of the President and at his discretion.

What are the terms in supporting assistance?

On such terms and conditions as he (the President) may determine to support and promote economic and political stability.

What are the terms under the contingency fund?

When he (the President) determines such use to be important to the national interest.

So we are actually talking about \$580 million. And I suggest to you that a reduction of \$50 million is badly needed to

improve the administration of this act, for several reasons.

First, the amount of this authorization is unwarranted, unnecessary, and excessive.

The second reason I would submit to you is that this amount of money encourages poor planning by the administration. In the last 3 years there were 13 nations that received money out of the contingency fund. But to my surprise and yours there were 3 of the 13 nations that received money out of the contingency fund in each one of the last 3 years. There were 9 of the 13 countries that received this money from the contingency fund that received it in both years during the last 2 years.

Why did we have to give the United Arab Republic \$25 million in the last 2 years out of the contingency fund? Why did we have to give the Dominican Republic \$48.9 million out of the contingency fund if the planning was adequate in the State Department and by the AID officials who are handling the use of this contingency fund?

Now, Mr. Chairman, a third reason which I would like to submit for the adoption of this amendment is that the amount of money in this fund induces a snowballing-type of spending in getting rid of the money before the end of the fiscal year. Let us look at what has happened. If this is an emergency fund, why does the emergency always happen in April, May, and June of every year? Look at 1962, fiscal year 1962. In the first quarter there were only \$4 million of emergencies. In the second quarter there were \$36 million obligated. In the third quarter there was \$82 million obligated. In the fourth quarter there was \$167 million obligated.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee that the emergencies do not all occur during the last 3 months of the fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the last year, fiscal 1963. In the first quarter they obligated \$31 million. But during the third quarter they obligated \$41 million. In the fourth quarter they obligated \$89 million. Now, in the 1962 fiscal year in the last month of the year they obligated \$87.9 million, and on the last day of the fiscal year they obligated \$49 million.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee it is high time that we took a close look at some of the factors that are bringing into disrepute the administration of foreign aid. It is high time that we tightened up on some of the obvious needs for economy and better administration of the program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first we had better look at the reasons for a contingency fund. The contingency fund is not intended to finance a planned program.

Its purpose is to meet unforeseen contingencies. No projects are planned to be financed under this fund. The contingency fund has two purposes. One of the purposes is to meet the urgent requests which may arise for which no provision has been made in any part of this act. A second purpose is to meet emergencies which cannot be foreseen or are

not yet identified in sufficient detail to justify programming assistance for them.

Mr. Chairman, I will admit that I was not satisfied with the way the administration handled the contingency fund in fiscal year 1962. The members of the committee will remember that last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs criticized the handling of the contingency fund in its report.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep in focus the contingency fund now for fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964. I want to show to the members of the committee some of the improvements that have been made in the contingency fund. Last year Congress authorized \$300 million in the contingency fund. The Committee on Appropriations appropriated \$250 million. There was a \$15-million carryover, making a total in the contingency fund for fiscal year 1963 of \$265 million. Now in accordance with the committee recommendations only \$148 million of contingency fund money was obligated during fiscal 1963 and spent.

One hundred and seventeen million dollars was returned to the Treasury of the United States out of the contingency fund of 1963. There was no attempt to use up all the money at the last minute.

Let us consider the contingency fund in this authorization. When the budget message came up here in January it recommended \$400 million for the contingency fund. When the President's foreign aid message came up here in April it requested only \$300 million for the contingency fund. The Committee on Foreign Affairs in the bill before you has cut this to \$200 million.

There has to be some flexibility in this program. I cannot see where a cut of \$50 million in the authorization is justified. Certainly we have to be ready to deal with unforeseen emergencies and the contingency fund ought to be more than \$150 million in order to be adequate. It has never been as low as \$150 million in any previous year. The executive has administered the contingency fund prudently and on June 30 returned \$117 million to the Treasury.

If you provide an authorization of \$200 million it is still subject to review by the Committee on Appropriations. The President ought to have a contingency fund that is adequate and which he will use only to meet emergencies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend our Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for his splendid, forthright and forceful presentation to the House of the full meaning of the foreign aid program and the crucial nature of our action here in this body.

I feel that his eloquent speech yesterday was the turning point of this debate.

He gave us his position from his heart when he told us:

Foreign assistance to me has been the affirmative side of democracy in this great battle in this trying period of world history. I prefer to err on the side of strength. I feel that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear.

If, Mr. Chairman, I had been disposed to oppose any further extension of the foreign aid program, I certainly would have reexamined my position after our Speaker spoke to us. I find in his speech a complete affirmation of my own position.

Shortly after World War II the then Speaker of the House, our beloved JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, honored me by appointing me to the 18-member bipartisan committee which became known as the Herter committee. This committee traveled all the war-torn areas of Europe. We studied the desperate conditions on the continent. We wrote a report. And this report became the basis of the Marshall plan which, with the subsequent foreign aid programs which concern us here today, has demonstrated to the world the greatest compassion, the greatest generosity and the greatest friendship among men the world has ever known.

Later it was my privilege to travel all the islands of the Pacific, in Japan, and other areas of the Pacific war, as a member of a group appointed for this purpose by the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of what was then the Naval Affairs Committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I know something about the job that was ahead of us when we set out upon this program to rehabilitate war-torn nations.

I know now that our job is not completed. It is true that we have healed the physical wounds of war, but this foreign aid program now has turned into a gigantic undertaking to keep the free world strong, so that another holocaust does not engulf the whole of mankind.

It is true that on one or more occasions I have voted against foreign aid bills, but I did this because I wanted to emphasize that aid should not be provided to nations dominated by communism and in countries which would not cooperate with the free world in this life and death struggle with communism.

There are many reasons why we should act favorably upon this bill before us today.

It improves the former programs of aid to other peoples. It tightens up the aid operations.

The bill was presented to the House by a bipartisan vote of 24 to 7 in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Foreign aid has had the support of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. I believe that all of our Secretaries of State since the Great War, regardless of party affiliation, have supported it. Our ambassadors, who are on the watchtowers throughout the world, support this program.

It is my hope that out of this program will come a great surge in world trade. I hope that my own people down in North Carolina will be able to sell more tobacco and cotton and other things to our friends in other nations. I hope that each Member of this House will see the benefits of world trade, reflected in the well-being of industries in his own district.

For, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, ultimately, the friendship of na-

tions, as it is with men, must thrive on exchanges—the relationship of buyers and sellers, with each nation sharing the profits and pride of production and commerce.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I re-emphasize that in this disturbed, distracted, and dangerous world, we cannot go it alone.

Should we fold up and abandon the Alliance for Progress which will mean so much to the peace of the Western Hemisphere? Shall we withdraw our support for the Alliance, from the weak and underdeveloped countries of the Western World and let them become easy prey to communism?

Shall we leave South America, Central America, Asia, and Africa, and all the rest of the world to the tender mercies of communism, and draw the cloth of complacency around ourselves and try to live isolated from all the rest of the world? Remember, we tried isolation once. After World War I, we closed our eyes to the agonies of the rest of the world, and we believed that no power on earth could endanger our security or disturb the peace of our people. We learned a sad lesson and we learned it in the hard way and then we faced World War II wholly unprepared for the conflict which threatened and endangered the institutions of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, certainly in a program of this magnitude there must be some waste, but we have been assured that the expenditure of the dollars authorized by the bill before us will be safeguarded and that every dollar will be well and wisely spent in the interest of our Nation.

I stand with our Speaker in support of the foreign aid program. I agree with him that this is "the affirmative side of democracy."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 151, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby redesignated "Policy" and section 501, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out "the fiscal years 1962 and 1963" and "\$1,700,000,000 for each such fiscal year, which sums" and substitute "fiscal year 1964" and "\$1,225,000,000, which", respectively.

(b) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out "1963" in the first and second sentences and substitute "1964".

(c) At the end of such chapter, add the following new section:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, line 16, strike out "\$1,225,000,000" and substitute "\$1,000,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful, if my friend from Ohio is here, that I may have his help on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$225 million from the appropriation for military assistance. An analysis of expenditures and carryovers both reserved and unreserved provides ample evidence, in my opinion, that this request for military assistance can be reduced materially.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs made a token cut of \$180 million on the administration's asking price of \$1,405 million. My amendment would reduce the \$1,225 million contained in the bill to an even \$1 billion.

The time has come for a number of countries that have been receiving military aid to carry that load without assistance from the United States. It appears that as long as the downtrodden taxpayers of this country put up the cash, these countries will continue to—

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. HAYS. I just came in in time to hear the gentleman ask me to go along with him on this amendment. I will tell you what I will do. You amend your amendment and make it provide for a cut of \$100 million, and I will go with you.

Mr. GROSS. For \$100 million?

Mr. HAYS. We cut \$180 million out of it. I agree with you that this is one place it could be cut. But \$180 million plus \$225 million is a pretty healthy swipe. I will quote to you what the Clay report says. It says there are countries that are maintaining military forces too small to mount an invasion and too large for defense. I think it is fair to say that one of the sacred cows in here is Formosa. But I am willing, if you will take this amendment out and make it a cut of \$100 million, I will come down and try to help you get it over.

Mr. GROSS. That would not be very much of a saving, I will say to my friend, in view of some of the information I have had. The Clay Committee suggested that this go down to \$1 billion.

Mr. HAYS. Over a 3-year period.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but the Clay Committee was liberal with the taxpayers' money in some of its recommendations.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman says \$100 million is not very much. I am glad to know and have this establishment of the gentleman's credit, but it is a lot of money to me.

Mr. GROSS. I mean in relation to \$1,225 million.

Mr. HAYS. If you want to get your amendment through, you had better buy my offer.

Mr. GROSS. Seventy-five percent of this military assistance is supposed to be going to the periphery of the Soviet bloc and we have a number of so-called allies on the periphery of the Soviet bloc that ought to be coming in and helping out. As I stated before, the Clay Committee said that spending for military assistance can be reduced to around \$1 billion annually.

Secretary Rusk in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, in answer to questions posed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

I think one can properly say it is our objective to withdraw from the military assistance field—I would suppose in the longer run totally.

The Secretary of State said that in the longer run we can withdraw from this field totally. I suppose, if pinned down, he would have said in 25 to 50 years from now when a lot of taxpayers will be broke supporting this program, but if that is the way he feels about it and the way the Clay Committee feels about it, this is a good time to start to cut down.

Last year the Passman subcommittee was asked for military assistance funds for flexible purposes, no specifications but just flexible purposes. When pinned down General Palmer, the witness, said his face was red. He denied first that he had said that money was put into the request for flexible purposes. It is military assistance funds, as I understand it, that provided an air-conditioned yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know who paid for that gold-plated bed that the wife of one of the government officials of Ghana bought in London. I do not know whether that came out of military assistance.

Take a look at Vietnam today. We are spending \$1 million a day in Vietnam, much of it on military assistance and we do not know whether we have been undermined by internal revolt as of this day and this hour.

According to last year's hearings of the Passman subcommittee, \$65,900,000 of military equipment, military assistance, went to Italy. There are those who will try to tell you that we long since stopped providing assistance to European countries. We gave Italy almost \$66 million in military equipment—a nation which we put on its feet with some \$8 billion of economic assistance, and yet only a short time ago, when the Italians held their last national election, the Communist vote increased by 1 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. I will astonish the gentleman by saying that I will support the amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will not agree that the testimony offered in support of this portion of the bill was the weakest that was offered?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I do agree with the gentleman.

In India, where we are pumping in military assistance this Government was told a few days ago, that the agreement made with us to permit a Voice of America transmitter in India, would not be carried out.

In far too many countries we are continuing to pour in military equipment, and getting far too little in return.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what our committee, the Appropriations Committee, is going to do with this item. I certainly am not trying to voice the views of that committee. I do want to submit just one or two personal observations, however, upon this amendment. To me one of the most essential problems that we have to consider today is our national defense, and I regard this program as a vital part of that defense. I do not know what the testimony was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs; frankly, I have not had an opportunity to read it. But I do know that General Lemnitzer, the Supreme Allied Commander, General Taylor, and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, appeared before our committee and said, "If you feel that you must cut any funds, we would rather that you cut our regular defense funds than to cut this figure. We think this is at rock bottom."

Let me suggest just this one further thought. The thing that gives me the gravest concern about the test ban treaty is that I fear it might cause the American people to drop their guard. We cannot afford to do that at this time. If, at this particular time, when we are considering the test ban treaty we begin to cut our defense, then I fear the American people may be lulled into a false sense of security and that we might drop our guard to the point where the defense of America may be endangered.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that I have been in favor of the foreign aid program but I have been foremost in efforts to cut the program down to size and to keep it at the lowest possible figure commensurate with the need. I do feel, however, that this cut would be a very serious mistake and might jeopardize our security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how much was in the pipeline for military assistance on July 1 of this year?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. GROSS. What was that figure?

Mr. GARY. We have it in our record. Our committee has been through all of that. The witnesses who testified before us also knew that figure and still they said that if they had to take a cut, they

would rather take it in their own appropriation than in this particular appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing classified about it. The figure is \$2.4 billion in the military assistance pipeline as of July 1, this year.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman knows that if you are going to supply armies you have to have a pipeline of equipment and materials on the way.

Mr. GROSS. But how much does the gentleman want them to have in new money—with a \$2.4 billion carryover?

Mr. GARY. I want them to have what they think is necessary to defend America. They testified before us that they felt that every dollar of this was necessary. I am not a military expert and I am not speaking as such.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would like to say that of this \$2.3 billion in the pipeline, 70 percent is leattime for ships which take 4 to 5 years to construct and it is for aircraft which take 18 to 24 months to put into operation. There is involved a great deal of complicated electronic equipment on which there is a great leadtime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia for his statement. The Secretary of Defense in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee stated, and I quote, "That the total Defense budget in terms of new obligational authority approximated \$53.5 billion. Were we to be requested to cut that budget \$300 million to \$400 million"—a figure which we are considering, I might say right here—"I would strongly urge that the cut be taken from those portions of the defense program other than the military assistance program. It would have first priority on the margin of dollars, in my mind."

So, Mr. Chairman, I think there is no question as to how the Secretary of Defense feels about this.

Mr. GARY. The Secretary of Defense told us the same thing. That was the statement he made. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL to the amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, line 16, strike out "\$1,225,000,000" and substitute "\$1,125,000,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I will use only a few seconds. It is obvious from the discussion which we have had that there is considerable agreement that these funds should be cut. At least we should call attention

to the necessity of efficiency in this particular phase of foreign aid spending.

Mr. Chairman, it is also obvious that there are Members on the floor who will support a moderate cut rather than the broader cut suggested by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to reduce the amount by \$100 million.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to put this back in focus, the Executive requested \$1,405,000,000 for military aid. The Committee on Foreign Affairs authorized \$1,225,000,000, which represented a cut of \$180 million.

Now, the appropriation—let me make clear that I refer to the appropriation and not the authorization, the appropriation for 1963—was \$1,325,000,000. So the appropriation last year was substantially greater than that requested this year.

Mr. Chairman, the committee took into consideration the Clay report. The Clay report recommended that military assistance should be phased down over a 3-year period to \$1 billion a year. We took that into consideration when we cut this amount of \$180 million from the request. We did not make a meat ax cut where we are just picking a round figure of \$100 million—out of the air. Last year our Review Subcommittee sent investigators to Europe and it made a detailed study of military aid to the NATO countries. Our subcommittee made a recommendation that we should phase out our military assistance to the nations of Western Europe more rapidly. They ought to be able now to carry their own load. This is the reason why we made the cut of \$180 million.

Mr. Chairman, we also took into consideration what General Clay said about the Asian countries and we pointed this out in our report. We specifically justified the cut. But the sum of \$180 million is a big cut. It is big enough and I feel this program cannot be cut any further.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that many of the older Members remember that here on the floor in 1961 the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], who is a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, took the floor and introduced an amendment to restore the \$300 million cut to military assistance. On the floor his amendment passed. He gave some specific reasons for increasing the military aid appropriation then and those reasons are as good today as they were then. He said that conditions in Berlin, Laos, South Vietnam were bad then, as they are today. He said that we accepted the military budgets recommended then by our own Army, Navy, and Air Force experts, and our own Secretaries of Defense, whether they were Tom Gates or Bob McNamara. He pointed out that we had just appropriated \$6 billion more for defense for 1962 than we had appropriated in 1961.

We followed their advice when they asked us for money for our own Army, our own Navy, and our own Air Force, and then we do not follow the same advice they give us for military assistance for our allies, for our own mutual security.

The same thing is true today. This program has been analyzed. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has made the cut after careful study. We cannot afford any more of a cut in military assistance.

I have always supported the military assistance part of the foreign aid and opposed separation of the military part of the program from the economic part of the program.

When I go home to my district I tell them I feel the foreign assistance program is part and parcel of our defense effort. I point out that it finances our military efforts all around the world. I do not think we can cut this military assistance another dime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman referred to General Clay and his testimony before the committee. I think it might be of interest to know that General Clay sent a telegram to me, and I imagine to some others, which I would like to quote:

I believe that the foreign aid bill now before the House represents a constructive approach to our foreign aid program and that it is deserving of strong bipartisan support. To reduce the authorization further this year, or to add restrictive amendments at this time, could hurt our position abroad. I believe that the present bill goes as far as is practicable or desirable at this time in our own interests. I would respectfully urge your support.

LUCIUS D. CLAY.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the military assistance program was not in the foreign aid bill I doubt whether you would even have a foreign aid bill. That is why the committee clings so tenaciously to the military assistance part of it.

Mr. MORGAN. The administration has been trying to separate military assistance from economic assistance for years.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Recognizing that certainly the defense of Western Europe is by indirection defense of the United States, let me ask the question: Can anyone give me figures as to what the nations of Western Europe, now in a much better position to provide funds for their own defense and their own security, are doing in the way of increasing their defense expenditures during that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman figures from memory, but in countries like Italy and most of

our NATO Allies they have increased their defense budgets.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true they are relying on us to do a job they should be doing themselves?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I do not think that is a correct statement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyr] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Kyr) there were—ayes 108, noes 122.

Mr. KYR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Kyr and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 167.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 170.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and that all debate close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was going to inquire if the chairman has any idea how many amendments are pending. They are coming in here now. I think there ought to be 9 or 10. However, some of them are duplications. There are four amendments on Cuba. However, they are practically the same. There are four amendments on the Bokaro steel mill which are practically the same. There are many duplications. I would say that there are not more than nine pending amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on his reservation?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have inquired at the desk and it is my information that there are already up there some 17 or more amendments. I cannot see for the life of me why we ought to go into a night session tonight when we can very well be here tomorrow. As far as I am concerned we can come in at 11 o'clock and consider the amendments that are still pending. I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] that he not press that unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the gentleman, if he examines the amendments, will find there are many duplications. I do not think there are 17 pending amendments. I think if the duplications are counted there are only about 9 or 10 amendments.

However, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 12, line after line 2, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. The authorization for an appropriation contained in this Act shall not be effective until such time as—

"(a) the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; or

"(b) the budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, reveals that the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted are in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that a balanced budget seems to be out of tune with the times. We do not hear much about a balanced budget as the goal of fiscal policy.

We have heard a lot about defense of freedom today. I happen to be in that circle of people, I hope an expanding circle, who believe that a sound dollar is our first line of defense and that we cannot possibly achieve a sound dollar if we persist in constant deficit financing.

What we are proposing to authorize here today is not really all our own money. We have the assurance a budget will be presented to us the first of the year which will be about \$10 billion in the red. What we are really considering is a proposal to encumber future generations, generations that have no opportunity to be heard or to vote here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to bring a balanced budget back into style, to reassert it as a desirable goal, and to give the President of the United States a strong incentive to give it first priority.

I suspect someone will say my amendment would stop foreign aid. Of course that is not true, as there are enough dollars in the foreign aid pipeline now to continue it for some 2 years. Others may suggest this is really an insidious effort to kill the foreign aid authorization bill. That would be true only if the President of the United States fails to give a balanced budget the first priority it deserves.

My amendment would do nothing more than require that the President present us with a balanced budget the first of the year if he wants to have access to the authorization contained in the 1963 foreign aid bill.

We all talk a lot about fiscal responsibility, about wanting to have a balanced budget. Here is our chance to do something more than just give it lip service. Here is our chance to vote for an amendment which would indeed pro-

vide an incentive for the President to present us with a balanced budget. I believe that the sound dollar is our first line of defense, and this is a good chance to find out how many join with me in this belief.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. In my opinion the adoption of this amendment would thrill the hearts of the taxpayers of this country and I believe the gentleman from Illinois is to be commended for offering it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out this is identically the same wording that the gentleman offered last week on the college aid bill. During the debate at that time I asked the question rather innocently was this offered on the duckpond bill? I called it the duckpond amendment and got myself into a hassle. I did not mention anyone when I referred to duckponds, but I point out the gentleman who offers it seems to pick and choose his spots. If he really wanted to be consistent he should have offered it on the \$20 million bill we had up to build nests for wild ducks.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to assure the gentleman I discovered this idea only recently in a public law enacted back in 1956, I believe. I assure the gentleman I intend to offer this amendment at every opportunity from now on.

Mr. HAYS. It is a little dangerous to make commitments. I found that out this afternoon. But I am going to keep my eye on him to see if he does offer it on every authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is appropriate. It is an amendment that I put on to a public works project in my own community. It did have a very fine effect and we did have a balanced budget. The project then moved ahead. The amendment did not do much more than that, but in a small way it contributed to a balanced budget. I do want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for first of all digging up this amendment and bringing it to light. It does bear on the very important subject of a balanced Federal budget. There have been speeches made today, yesterday and the day before appealing to patriotism for our own country and our concern for the people abroad. But let me assure the Members of the House the most serious problem that faces us today is our balance of payments, our domestic deficit and our own basic economy. We are not going along the lines to further a solution to these problems in this particular bill that is now before us. An adoption of this amendment, however, would help.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who proposes this amendment is opposed to communism, I am sure. This amendment, however, would prevent us from combating effectively the Communist

threat unless and until we have a balanced budget.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize there is a disposition to limit debate shortly. Since I have an amendment toward the end of the bill, I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to the contents of the amendment a little bit in advance so that they can learn about it and vote it up or down on the basis of knowledge rather than what one could say in half a minute.

My amendment would create a bipartisan study commission which would not only study the operation of the foreign aid program but would study the impediments to the investment of private capital with the objective of letting the economic development job be done by private capital and getting the Government out of the foreign economic development business eventually.

I have been voting for the foreign aid program ever since I came to this House, and I have served for the last 10 years on a committee investigating the foreign aid program. I have appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on many occasions in connection with recommendations growing out of our committee's investigation. Our committee was commonly known as the Hardy committee.

I have listened to this debate and I know it reflects the temper of the American people who are becoming concerned about this program going on and on and on and being mismanaged and never coming to an end.

There are about \$4 billion a year of their funds involved. Are we being saddled with this for the rest of our existence or are we going to taper this program off and get it—at least the economic development aspects of it—into the private channels where it belongs? I suggest the creation of a study commission, and the reason I am suggesting it, is that we have wrestled with the problem here in the House and we have not had the ability to solve this problem and taper off this program as far as Government expenditures are concerned.

This Hoover-type Commission, composed of two Members of the House of either party, two members from private life appointed by the Speaker of the House, one from either party, and similarly two Members of the Senate of either party, and two individuals appointed by the Vice President from private life of either party, and four appointed by the President. This would be a 12-member Commission on the order of the Hoover Commission. With an adequate staff, it

seems to me, this body could penetrate beneath the surface of some of these difficult problems and come up with some intelligent recommendations for administrative reform and legislation to bring order out of the chaos we have had in this program and make some orderly plans for its termination.

If this is not done, I predict that the temper of the American people as has been reflected in the votes on the amendments here today will finally abruptly terminate this program and it may do a great deal of harm.

I urge the support of my amendment when it comes up.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

Sec. 301. Section 601(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "and" at the end of paragraph (3).

(b) Strike out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

(c) At the end thereof add the following new paragraphs:

"(5) utilize, wherever practicable, the services of United States private enterprise (including, but not limited to, the services of experts and consultants in technical fields such as engineering); and

"(6) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment, and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries."

Sec. 302. Section 611(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out "circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget" and substituting "the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWENGEL

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWENGEL: Page 13, immediately after line 7 insert the following:

"Section 303, section 611, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The President shall establish such procedures as he may deem necessary to assure to the maximum extent practicable all contracts for construction outside the United States made in connection with any agreement or grant subject to subsection (a) of this section shall be made in accordance with the same standards applicable to contracts made by the Federal Government for similar construction within the United States."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I have examined the gentleman's amendment. I want to

know if this is any change in the basic policy that is now in the bill. Does this make the borrowing country take basic responsibility for contracting?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It does.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the United States review the bids and contracts to ascertain that they are fair and prudent and does it also require that all bid specifications are in standards, to which U.S. business could respond?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment seeks to do is to require that the administrator of the act apply so far as is practical the rules, regulations, and standards that are applied in the construction of public works and other projects in the United States where Federal funds are appropriated and spent.

This change will improve the administration of the act. It will tend to improve the confidence of American citizens in the foreign aid program and will cause in the long run to win respect from the foreign nations with whom we share a common interest.

It is in the public interest. It also serves to enhance the goals we want to achieve for freedom on the foreign front.

I hope the amendment passes and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 8:

"Sec. 303. Section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba, is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert '(1)' immediately after '(a)'.

"(b) Insert immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contribution to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.'"

"(c) At the end thereof add the following new paragraph:

"(2) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any government of Cuba, nor shall Cuba be entitled to receive any quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States or to receive any other benefit under any law of the United States, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 13, line 19, strike out "graph:" and insert in lieu thereof "graphs:".

Page 14, line 10, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"(A) to prevent ships under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any equipment, materials, or commodities from the ports of Communist countries, as defined in section 620(f) of this Act, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

"(B) to prevent ships under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is practically self-explanatory but I think a few remarks probably are in order. This is what this amendment does:

1. CLOSES PRESENT GAP IN STATUTORY COVERAGE

Sections 107 (a) and (b) of the fiscal year 1963 Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act proscribe (a) any assistance to countries which permit ships of their registry to carry Battle Act commodities to Cuba, and (b) economic assistance to countries which permit ships of their registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba. Therefore countries receiving only military assistance which permit their ships to carry items of economic assistance are not reached by the present legislation.

The language of the proposed amendment would eliminate this gap and proscribe assistance to any country, ships of whose registry carry either Battle Act commodities or items of economic assistance to Cuba. Our experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that the following MAP recipient countries, would be affected by this tightened legislation if they have not taken or do not take the appropriate steps contemplated by the amendment: Great Britain, Lebanon, Italy, Norway, Denmark, West Germany, and Yugoslavia. It does not appear that Danish or West German ships will again be involved in the Cuba trade. West Germany has taken legal action.

2. COVERS ALL BLOC CARGO TO CUBA ON FREE WORLD SHIPS

In fact, this statutory language proscribes assistance to any country, ships of whose registry carry cargo of any type from bloc ports to Cuba. This is true because it is presumed that some or all of such cargo has been provided on sufficiently concessional terms to constitute items of economic assistance. Therefore phrase (c) is gratuitous since this coverage is already effected by the administration's presumption but may be appropriate politically.

3. REQUIRES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WITHIN 60 DAYS

The statutory language presently in effect speaks of countries which "permit" ships under their registry to engage in carriage covered by the statute. The new language requires countries to take appropriate steps within 60 days to prevent such carriage. This follows the hard approach of the Hickenlooper amendment (section 620(d)), by requiring affirmative action by the appropriate governments and it allows only 60 days for such action, unlike section 620(d) which permits up to 6 months.

4. IMPOSES PETROLEUM DELIVERY BURDEN ON BLOC SHIPPING CAPABILITY

There is no evidence that any free world country has furnished "Battle Act" commodities or "items of economic assistance" to Cuba. However, crude oil from bloc sources is probably an "item of economic assistance" since bloc countries are extending noncommercial credit terms to Cuba. Our experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that some free world tankers are carrying bloc crude oil to Cuba. Because of the policy and purposes of the Battle Act, crude oil has not been placed on the Battle Act list of embargoed commodities. Therefore, pursuant to section 107(a), military assistance is not prohibited where MAP recipient countries permit ships of their registry to carry bloc crude oil to Cuba.

The new statutory language would proscribe all assistance to countries which do not take appropriate steps to prevent tankers under their registry from carrying bloc crude oil. Thus, this amendment would impose the burden of crude oil delivery on Soviet bloc transport capability. At the same time the purposes of the Battle Act—to control, through international cooperation, exports of items of strategic significance to nations threatening the security of the United States—will be maintained.

5. MAKES POLICY AND LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE PERMANENT

Since the proposed statutory language would be an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, it would be a permanent legislative directive rather than a limitation contained in an annual appropriations bill.

We have taken several positive steps in the direction of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world. This included a total ban on transportation of U.S.-financed goods by ships that have been to Cuba; an embargo on United States trade with Cuba, which was written into law by an amendment which I offered. In addition, Congress adopted as a rider in the 1963 Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, in which we had a provision prohibiting the furnishing of military assistance to MAP recipient countries whose ships carried Battle Act commodities to Cuba and prohibiting economic assistance to countries that permitted their ships to carry items of economic assistance.

What the amendment does is close the gap that is now in the existing law. The limitation now in the law, does not proscribe economic assistance. It only affects those countries getting military assistance, and therefore, one of the

major purposes of the amendment is to make it clear that we are talking about economic assistance as well.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman, how much leeway is left to the executive branch of the Government to put those provisions into effect?

Mr. FASCELL. We have a 60-day provision asking for affirmative steps to be taken by our allies in meeting the provisions of this amendment. Then, of course, there is the general provision under the Foreign Assistance Act with regard to waiver of provisions by the President. But there is no waiver in this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. No; but this amendment amends existing law which does give leeway to the Executive. The Battle Act provides, for instance, if the President deems it in the interest of the United States to do thus and so, he can apply the Battle Act or nullify it.

Mr. FASCELL. This amendment does not change that act in any way.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the thing I want to know is how much leeway do you give the President—any President—to put into effect these provisions?

Mr. FASCELL. We give him no leeway except that which now exists in law. But as far as the amendment is concerned, the amendment is clear in its legislative intent. All the amendment seeks to do is to go one step further and close the gap on shipping to Cuba which now exists in order to assist the President in carrying out this intent.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, has it not been the legislative intent and the intent of Congress, let me put it that way, that restrictive provisions be put upon Cuba and that it be isolated and yet it has not been?

Mr. FASCELL. I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that I just want to make it clear that by this legislative language there is no question of what the intent of Congress is. That is the purpose of this amendment. That is all it seeks to do.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATTIN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: On page 13, strike out line 11 through 17 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Amend paragraph (a)(1) thereof to read as follows:

"(1) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to the Government of Cuba and no assistance under said Act shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry, or foreign aircraft, to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry to Cuba or to export from Cuba, so long as it is governed by Castro or any other Communist regime, any military personnel, arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic en-

ergy materials, petroleum, or any articles, materials, or supplies, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title 1, of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(2) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry, or foreign aircraft, to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry passengers or import from or export to Cuba any items so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or any other Communist regime, unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the security of the United States and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination. The restrictions contained in this paragraph may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act or any other provision of law.

"(3) As an additional means of implementing and carrying into effect the policy of paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2), the President is authorized to establish and maintain a total embargo upon the island of Cuba.

"(4) No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba."

On page 13, line 20, strike the "(2) and insert in lieu thereof (5)".

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be too controversial because I have a letter in my hand from Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State. Some time ago a group of our colleagues wrote a letter to the President asking him about free world shipping that was presently going into Cuba. I have the letter, which is dated August 16, and it states in part:

After consideration at the White House, the letter signed by you and your colleagues concerning free world trade and shipping with Cuba has been sent to this department for reply. As you are aware from his many statements on the subject, your views are in accord with those of the President on the goal of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world.

This is one of the few times the President and I have found ourselves in agreement.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. As a matter of clarification, I would like to ask whether or not the sentence in the last paragraph of your substitute is not already contained almost in the same words in the bill pending at the present time, and I refer to page 13.

Mr. BATTIN. I will say to the gentleman that it is, and the language was submitted in the committee and accepted by the committee, by our colleague and

a very interested citizen, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. The reason for striking out the language in my amendment was to have continuity of the numbering of the sections and for no other reason.

I will say further, Mr. FASCELL's amendment does not go as far as this one, particularly the language dealing with aircraft. We find that the Cabana Airlines, along with others, are using flights as a means of moving agents in and out of this hemisphere. This is the means that the Communists are using to move people from Cuba to other countries and then into Central and South America.

There has been complete harmony on the floor today when Cuba has been discussed. Everybody wants to do something. Now we have that opportunity. The language of the amendment is about the same the House adopted last year in the appropriations act. I am sure the impression was left with the Members—it was with me—that this would do the job. The reason I wrote the letter to the President and as stated in the reply it did not do the job. About 50 percent of the ships going into Cuba today are free-world ships, the primary ones being the British fleet, the Greek, Italians and the Norwegians. It was stated in the letter I have referred to that it was not a violation of the language of the appropriation act, for these ships were going to Cuba empty and carrying Cuban exports away from the island. This, again, is the reason for the amendment so we can stop the flow in and out of Cuba. You cannot have an economic blockade when in fact the people who are the beneficiaries of our aid program are allowed to trade with the Cubans.

The amendment gives the President the opportunity, if he feels it is in the best interest of the security of the United States, to go ahead and allow ships to trade with Cuba. He can so state.

I do urge your support of the amendment. I think it is high time that we stopped free-world shipping to Cuba.

Should the amendment fail it would mean a reversal of the basic position of this House a year ago.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF FLORIDA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Immediately after "ships" each place it appears insert "or aircraft".

Amend subparagraph (iii) to read as follows:

"(iii) Any other equipment, materials, or commodities."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, for some number of months now I have imposed upon the patience of the membership of the House in order to discuss Cuba and the problems that we face. I have been very grateful to the membership for your bearing with me and those of us in Florida who are probably more concerned because Cuba is closest to us—not that all Americans are not concerned about this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in hope that if adopted, it will provide the incentive for foreign nations to cease trading with Communist Cuba.

It is evident from the figures obtained from naval intelligence and the Maritime Administration that free world shipping to Cuba has been increasing steadily over that of Russian shipping since April of this year, and that the trend in this increase became clear much earlier in the year. In view of these continual reports, I feel that all foreign aid to any country doing trade or furnishing assistance to Communist Cuba should be ended.

Some facts and figures should bear out this proposal. Since the beginning of this year numerous free world nations have allowed their flag ships to carry Russian and Soviet bloc goods to Cuba. The leaders in this shipping to Cuba have been as follows: Britain 80 trips, Greece 63 trips, Lebanon 31 trips, Norway 10 trips, and Italy 10 trips; to name just a few of the free world shippers to Communist Cuba. I find it hard to understand why these five countries mentioned specifically received in fiscal year 1962 some \$222,400,000 in outright grants through our foreign aid program, and yet thwarted the best interests of the United States by continuing to ship to Cuba and prolonging Red domination of that island. Is this what the United States should expect from its allies?

The United States has long been a world leader in subsidizing the nations of the world with her benevolent helping hand. The motto of the U.S. Government has been, "We ask not what can you do for us, but rather what can we do for you?" We often seem to hand out millions of dollars in yearly grants to countries with military and economic needs, and yet have little response to our needs from these same nations. The upshot of this approach is shown in the way the free world nations have continued to trade with Communist Cuba. These countries are supposed to be our allies—why do they continue to act against the best interests of the United States and the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere? Why do they continue to keep Cuba supplied with goods that keep communism alive? Why do they who say they abhor Communist domination foster its growth by continuing shipping to Cuba? If we continue to give and give to nations who have not the same goals of freedom and willingness to act against communism in this hemisphere, then we are subsidizing those who in effect are aiding Castro and communism, which is clearly against our own foreign policy and best interests.

I feel that this amendment will effectively cause a ban on trade with Cuba by free world nations, and hopefully will give impetus to the economic collapse of that Red island, which in the long run will end Communist tyranny and restore freedom and democracy to that country. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I have gone over both of these amendments now, and I certainly feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] as amended by my amendment will do this. It says we do not want any aid to any country which will allow its ships or its airplanes to go into or from Cuba taking any equipment, any materials, or any goods.

There is no point in our giving aid to countries which are helping to build communism in this hemisphere.

Let me just give you quickly 2 or 3 facts that I think we ought to consider in adopting this amendment: January, overall world shipping this year down to 12 ships. Russian ships were 35. Look what has happened. In February allied shipping started at 19, went up to 28 in March, 37 in April, 44 in May, and 43 in June, and it is continuing. If we will adopt my amendment, reject the substitute and adopt the FASCELL amendment, we will stop this, and this is what we ought to do. I hope this House will join in telling these nations, "We are not going to give you aid to help build communism in Cuba."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. May I ask the gentleman, has he had the benefit of reviewing the language of the substitute amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes; I have.

Mr. FASCELL. Am I correct in stating that under the language of the substitute there is no 60-day waiting period to get any action from any allies who might be involved?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is correct. This is not what causes me concern. This amendment provides 60 days to tell our own allies that we want them to stop shipping to Cuba and do it quickly. I do not think that is unreasonable.

Mr. FASCELL. Has the gentleman examined the language that deals with the proscription on economic assistance? Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the economic assistance program does or does not apply to ships in the language of the substitute?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It appears to me that in the language of the substitute it applies to airports, therefore it avoids in paragraph 2 the question of shipping.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman did not look at it very closely.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, I have read it closely, especially paragraph 2.

Mr. BATTIN. I have yet to see a ship dock at an airport. This becomes a difficult thing. I do not see anything further in the gentleman's amendment that prohibits any further action of waiving the provisions of this act, talking about using a battleax, contained in the substitute, and perhaps we ought to go one step further.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentleman is talking about the point the gentleman from Iowa brought up. The FASCELL amendment says this is to be the

law. In the gentleman's amendment there is this waiver.

Mr. BATTIN. Section 614 would allow the waiver.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I disagree with the gentleman on his interpretation as between the two amendments. Further, I should like to point out that in paragraph 2, if you will read it, you will find these words:

No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry or foreign aircraft to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry passengers or import or export to Cuba.

The gentleman has left out "port." The gentleman has put in airports, but ships do not use airports. So the amendment is defective.

Mr. BATTIN. If the gentleman will yield, it says ships under the responsibility of that country.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is, to use its airports or overfly the country. Of course, ships do not do that, so the substitute is defective. I think the gentleman means well, I know, but I would hope you would vote for my amendment and against the substitute and then for the Fascell amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to warmly commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] for this amendment and my colleague [Mr. FASCELL] for the amendment which he has sought to be amended and I heartily associate myself with both gentlemen.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time hopefully to clarify perhaps the procedural aspect of the situation and also to discuss some of the statements already made with regard to the respective amendments, and the substitute amendment.

I am in favor of the Battin substitute, as a stronger measure as compared to both the Fascell amendment and the amendment to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS.] For these following reasons: This amendment was drafted in keeping with the language contained in and passed by this Committee, so far as I know, unanimously last session, as written into the appropriations bill and it was drafted on the basis of section 107 (a) and (b) of the last session of Congress, in actions relating to appropriations—but with needed strengthening amendments. That is the history of the draftsmanship of the legislation.

The amendment is stronger. It covers all aircraft, not only those registered with the air recipient country. It covers trade from as well as to Cuba by any such nations.

Now it has been said, 60 days should be given to the administration to let these other countries conform. Under

last year's bill, they have had a year to conform. What we are complaining about, and why we have drafted this amendment in the form we have, and the Fascell amendment and the Rogers amendment to the amendment will not accomplish that, is to require the administration to acknowledge and carry out what the Congress intended before, but perhaps defectively stated, giving the President an out whereby the President of the United States could use his discretion—which he has done—and not enforce what I believe to be the clear intent stated by the Congress of the United States—no aid to any country that trades with Cuba. You do not need 60 days more. It has been in excess of a year since Congress spoke for an aid ban to trade-with-Cuba nations in 1962.

What does the Fascell amendment and the Rogers amendment to it do in comparison to the substitute? Well, the door is wide open for the President to do nothing; what he has done all last year, and that is little or nothing. That is what the complaint is. The Battin amendment strengthens the present law.

But the substitute provides that the President shall conform to the intent of the Congress and shall not be able to waive that announced intent pursuant to section 614. Section 614 permits the President to waive, despite what the Congress said in the appropriation bill, to waive that intent and purpose, as he sees fit to do.

The amendment proposed, the substitute by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] has the objective of preventing section 614 authority on the part of the President to, in effect, repeal what the Congress says the President should do in the first instance—that is, cut off aid to any country that trades with Cuba.

Let me say further, the question was asked with regard to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the amendment, that no funds provided under this act shall be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba.

Now this corrects a very significant technical error made, in my opinion, by the committee. If the chairman of the committee will be kind enough to look at the committee report at page 71, section 620, the chairman I am sure will see in drafting the amendment adopted in committee to the basic 1961 act that the "No funds provided under this act" relating to the United Nations, in effect, going to Cuba that the following sentence says as follows and I quote:

As an additional means of implementing and carrying into effect the policy of the preceding sentence, the President is authorized to establish and maintain a total embargo upon all trade between the United States and Cuba.

What does that have to do with the United Nations and international organizations? What has happened is that if this substitute does not pass, from the manner in which this legislation is drafted, you are going to take the heart right out of the President's power to im-

pose an embargo by relating it back to the United Nations instead of the trade aspects in the first sentence. This is cured by the Battin but not the Fascell amendment. So what is going to happen is that unless this substitute is adopted, the very heart of the embargo is going to be cut right out from under the President and his power to exercise it. In addition to that, the substitute does not only provide for a ban so long as the "Castro regime" is in power in Cuba—and this is important, because we do not know how long Castro will be there, but we know the Communists will probably be there a long time unless something is done about it—the Battin amendment provides not only for "Castro" but for "any Communist regime in Cuba," that the President shall have this power to cut off aid to countries doing business with Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I have earlier pointed out that on any further requests for extensions of time we would object, and I now object.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we must take steps to effect the most stringent measures against Castro's Cuba. The substitute would accomplish this purpose much more completely.

The Communist stranglehold on Cuba continues unabated. This substitute amendment will provide a nonmilitary restriction on trade with Cuba. It will also be effective in preventing the transportation of personnel into and out of Cuba.

Cuba's economic life is vitally dependent on certain major exports, and a vast number of imports. The current difficulties in the realization of its ambitious industrialization program show that the country is extremely vulnerable to any interruption of the flow of foreign trade. Whenever it has been possible to collect facts on Cuban trade, it has become abundantly clear that the Communist world is unable to supply all the basic essentials so desperately needed by Cuba.

In pre-Castro days, the United States functioned as major supplier and purchaser of Cuban needs and exports. Now that the U.S. embargo on Cuban exports and imports is in operation, and the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply Cuba's needs, many free world countries have stepped in to take a percentage of Cuban trade.

The United States has asked its free world partners to assist in enforcing the embargo, but significant cooperation on the part of the free world countries has been disappointing. There are 66 free world countries trading with Castro, and 54 of these countries are receiving some form of American foreign aid. Nations of the free world have also provided the bulk of the shipping to Cuba in recent months.

On Monday, August 19, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], indicated that since April the free world countries have sent more ships to Cuba than have the Russians.

Shipping to Cuba

	Free world	Russian
January.....	12	35
February.....	19	34
March.....	28	32
April.....	37	27
May.....	44	38
June.....	43	31
July (incomplete).....	28	23

In addition, Spain and Mexico are currently flying their transport aircraft into Cuba, and British Guinea is negotiating an air link with Cuba.

One of the most effective ways to stifle the Communist dictatorship in Cuba would be to eliminate trade by the nations of the free world to which we are giving our foreign aid. If we were to ask nations in the free world to stop trading and shipping to Cuba, some of their reactions might be negative. However, if we attach a few strings to our foreign aid to these countries, I believe that very rapidly we would see an almost complete cessation of trade by the free world with Cuba.

It seems inconsistent to the welfare of the United States that we should help finance and support those nations who are trading and shipping to Cuba for profit. This is a peaceful, nonmilitary, positive action, and it will be effective in curtailing communism in Cuba. I believe that this kind of positive leadership will be applauded by both nations of the Western Hemisphere and those nations throughout the world who believe that communism should be stopped.

The Communist bloc countries would, indeed, have a difficult time in providing the current volume of trade to Cuba. If the aircraft of those nations who are receiving American aid did not fly into Cuba, the flow of Communist agents to the free world would be greatly curtailed.

The substitute amendment is designed to prevent the American taxpayers' money from going to those nations who would knowingly help to preserve a Communist dictatorship which is just 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have looked over the three amendments, and I think the Fascell amendment as perfected by the Rogers amendment will do exactly what is needed with respect to trade with Cuba. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS, is strong and will be effective. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Fascell amendment as amended be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas had it.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BATTIN and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 176.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the amendment by Mr. FASCELL: Amend the Fascell amendment, as amended, by inserting immediately before the quotation marks at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The restrictions contained in this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this act or in any other provision of law."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we are getting to the crux of the real difference between the substitute and the amendment, and that is with regard to whether or not we are going to write into the law meaningful and mandatory restrictions on trading by other nations that receive our aid with Cuba or not. That is all there is to it.

This amendment, if adopted, will provide such a mandatory restriction. Without it, such mandate will not exist and the status quo will prevail.

If that is not done, of course, what you are going to end up with is exactly what we have now. That is what the problem is. You are going to end up with precisely the situation you have now, with the President in his discretion waiving the Fascell amendment. That is all he has to do, and in his discretion he can do that if he wants to do it. He waives it. The Congress is not saying to the President of the United States or the people of the United States we are going to stop sending any money aid to any country that continues to trade with Cuba. We are not saying that at all under the Fascell amendment.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. I have not seen a copy of the Battin amendment, but as I heard it read it seems to me it did have within itself such a provision. If we were to adopt this amendment we would have a much more restrictive situation than we would have had under the Battin amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that is not necessarily true, not under the present law, section 614, and the Battin amendment was drafted in exactly the same language as my amendment. We are attempting to put in the Fascell amendment the restrictions contained in the Battin amendment, the same paragraph the gentleman referred to, which added that the President shall notify the respective committees if trade is permitted to continue. The President had to take official

action. The restrictions contained in this paragraph I am offering may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this act or any other provision of law. So the objective is to prevent the President from doing exactly what he has been doing under the present law that has been so ineffective.

I think the House made a mistake in not accepting the Battin amendment. It is a strong amendment, and I think it would do the job, not half a job. The Fascell-Rogers amendment if adopted does a half job. The amendment with this additional amendment I propose will put some of the teeth back into what was previously the Battin amendment by making the prohibition against aid going to countries that trade with Cuba mandatory.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. The Battin amendment contained a waiver provision, where the President had to make a positive determination in order to waive the provisions, but now if you would attach this to the Fascell amendment there would be absolutely no circumstances, not even if the President affirmatively declared it to be in the interest of the United States, in which he could waive the provisions. I think it goes too far.

Mr. CRAMER. It does exactly what has to be done if we are going to tighten up what has been going on in the past. The President under the present law and the Fascell amendment makes a determination it is all right for the United States to continue to give aid to these countries even though they continue to trade with Cuba because the Executive considers it is in the "national interest." Well, now, we might as well not pass any amendment unless my amendment is adopted to it. We passed amendments to the appropriations bill last year and these amendments were fashioned to some extent as is the Fascell amendment, but we find that the administration in effect ignored them. They said we are conforming to the law because we have this, we have section 614 that is a part of the existing law, that if the President decides it is in the national interest he may waive this prohibition or any other. So all the President did was to waive it. He said it was in the national interest and he waived it.

Over 50 percent of the shipping with Cuba today is through free world ships—50 percent of the ships continue to be free world ships. That in itself proves that the present wording, which is about the same as the Fascell wording, is not going to accomplish the objective of cutting off assistance to nations who trade and allow these subversives to go into Cuba through the use of airlines from Mexico and from Spain, and let these subversives go to Cuba and be trained to the extent that the Selden committee found and the Stennis Senate committee found, despite the resolution passed by Congress in September of last year, that these subversive activities have been gaining so fast that it is now against

the best interests and the security of the United States. So if you want an amendment with teeth in it, you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to disagree with my distinguished colleague. His amendment could injure NATO and the vital security interests of the United States. In the substitute, on which we have already acted, there appeared the language, "unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the security of the United States and reports such determination to the respective committees of the House." There is a similar waiver provision under existing law, and I stated in response to the inquiry from the gentleman from Iowa that I make no change in that.

When we wrote the embargo provision in this law the law also contained the waiver provisions under section 614 and yet the President imposed the embargo. The purpose of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is to strike out the application of section 614—that is what he says—notwithstanding the fact that this inflexibility would force the stopping of U.S. military aid to a staunch U.S. ally who was not able to immediately stop one of its chartered vessels from entering Cuba. Thus the gentleman's amendment is dangerous. The amendment to the amendment is not necessary, because under section 614 of the present law the President now has to make the determination for a waiver in the interest of national security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We do not have the Battin amendment before us. We have the Rodgers-Fascell amendment before us. Let us tighten this up to where we have some meaning. Let us mean what we say and say what we mean for once.

Mr. FASCELL. I think the amendment is amply clear. I do not think it is necessary to waive the provisions of section 614 as they apply to the President of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what is best in the national security interests of the United States. I ask, therefore, that my colleague's amendment to my amendment be defeated and my amendment allowing us to take further strong economic action against the Communist Government of Cuba be adopted.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this happens to be a subject that interests me. I am unable to follow the subject as it has proceeded. Therefore, I should like to ask the originator of the original amendment, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], a specific question. Under the language of his amendment, if a nation chooses to trade with Cuba, can it receive aid under this bill under any circumstances?

Mr. FASCELL. Only if the President determines that it is in the national

security interest. The difference is, however, that my amendment has no waiver; that waiver is contained in present law, whereas under the Battin substitute a waiver was written into the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. We are not now considering the Battin substitute?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Therefore, under the gentleman's amendment as it is presently written, if the President wishes for any reason to determine that it is for the security of the United States, any nation receiving aid can trade with Cuba. Is this correct?

Mr. FASCELL. No. Only for national security interests. In any event we cannot stop any country from trading. We can only stop our aid.

The only additional remark I would make is that this is the same criterion that was proposed in the Battin substitute. There is no difference.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Now I should like to ask this of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. In the Fascell amendment as amended by your amendment, can any nation receiving aid trade with Cuba under any circumstances?

Mr. CRAMER. Under the present law, if it is in the national interest, it can be, and that is what has happened.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Under the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, can the President make a determination that it is in the interest of the national security?

Mr. CRAMER. Under my amendment, no—under the Fascell amendment, yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. I think we are playing on words here, but it becomes important at this point because in the language of section 164 and also, I believe, in the language of the Battle Act, it refers to national interest. In the amendment I offered, it does not refer to the national interest but it refers to national security, which makes to me a substantial amount of difference.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But as I understand it, we are not dealing now with that distinction. On the one hand, if the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is accepted, the Presidential determination is not a question that matters; do I understand that that is correct?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. My amendment gives the direction to the President and states specifically that trade shall not continue with Cuba by nations that get United States freedom dollars to trade with Communists. That is what it does and it does not permit the Executive to continue to do as they have been doing all this year despite the fact that we wrote into the appropriation bill in the last

session, to continue to give aid to countries trading with Cuba. It closes the loophole.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, as I see it in voting on your amendment, it is a determination by this Congress which, in our opinion, is most in the national interest—the possibility of nations who receive our aid trading with Cuba—or the possibility of our dollars which we give in aid being used by nations to trade with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FASCELL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 161.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes no. So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my understanding is, after checking at the desk, there are 16 amendments, 13 of which would require individual action. In all my time here I have attempted, whether in the majority or minority, to expedite the business of the House of Representatives and I intend to continue in that fashion. But I must say that with those amendments, many of which are very important and on which Members want to speak, to undertake to consider them all tonight, when we could meet again tomorrow and in the time that would be afforded continue with a careful consideration of this very important measure, that I cannot go along and agree to that unanimous consent request; and so, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have not suggested any limitation of time, but merely that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman, I have been around here just a little while. Once you get that unanimous-consent request through, then if you see fit you can move to shut off debate on the bill and all amendments thereto; and if you have the votes to do it then, of course, you could roll over us and that would end the show.

So, Mr. Chairman, I object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 13, line 12, strike out "first" and insert "second".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this will take just a moment. I should hope the chairman of the committee would accept this amendment because otherwise I am afraid that the whole Cuban program as it relates to the President's power to establish and maintain a total embargo is going right down the drain. The reason is, if you look on page 71 of the report you will see this sentence:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

Following this is the President's embargo powers under present law but as amended these powers are out of place and refer to the wrong sentence in the amended version.

Now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs added a sentence to that section 620 relating to the United Nations going to Cuba. The sentence that follows the amendment sentence deals with the discretion for an embargo. So, that you cannot have an embargo at all unless the amendment is agreed to because the embargo sentence refers to the "preceding sentence" and refers to, although it has no relationship to, the presently amended U.N. sentence to which it refers.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. We have examined the gentleman's amendment. I think there is enough room in this Cuban situation for all of the Florida Representatives to get some credit. So, we will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. This has nothing to do with credit. I just wish you had accepted the other amendment too to make the trade ban on Cuba effective by cutting off all aid to nations trading with Cuba on a mandatory rather than discretionary basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 304. Section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to suspension of assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In clause (2), immediately after "operational conditions," insert "or has taken other actions,".

(b) Strike out "equitable and speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange" and insert in lieu thereof "speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange equivalent to the full value thereof".

Sec. 305. Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing certain assistance to Communist countries, is amended by inserting immediately before the period after "Union of Soviet Social-

ist Republics" the following: "(including its captive constituent republics)".

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for adopting the amendment to section 620(f), the purpose of which is clearly to identify the Soviet Union as a colonial power and to recognize the unremitting struggles for national independence carried on by the peoples of the captive non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union.

This is a very significant amendment. It can have far-reaching political effects in support of peace with freedom.

There is real drama in this committee finding, as the committee report on page 32 points out, because it gives open and official announcement to the fact that our Government regards the Soviet Union for what it is—an evil prison house for many once free and independent nations.

That is what the committee means when it refers to the captive republics of the Soviet Union.

This amendment serves to undo some of the damage done to our national prestige and to our historic role in support of national independence movements caused by the ill-advised letter of Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the chairman of the Rules Committee in which the Secretary put himself on record as a defender of Russian imperialism.

The letter to which I refer was sent by Secretary Rusk in opposition to the then pending resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

It is no exaggeration to observe that much of the current suspicions which attach to our foreign policy motives, arose from the repercussions to the Rusk letter.

In that letter Secretary Rusk held that such nations as Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia were historic parts of a Russian state—the Soviet Union—and for our Government to take note of the national independence movements in those nations, would offend Russian sensitivities.

The implications of such thinking are all too obvious, particularly to scholars of international political affairs.

It is little wonder that among interested groups here at home as well as among our proven friends and allies abroad, questions arose as to what sort of deal had been made, or was in the making, with imperial Russia to work out a formal status quo which would put an official stamp of approval on the captivity of one third of the human family.

Moreover, we need look no further than the Rusk letter for a basic source of public suspicion about some sort of hidden political deal concealed behind the limited test ban treaty now before the Senate.

Policy positions announced by the Secretary of State are not expected to be arrived at without due and full consideration of all the facts and consequences involved.

It is regrettable that Secretary Rusk has not withdrawn or repudiated his letter to the Rules Committee.

Nevertheless, these circumstances serve to underscore the importance of the committee amendment to section 620(f).

I hope the Secretary will take proper note of the cogent observations on this issue contained in the committee report and that he will be guided accordingly.

There is another noteworthy feature attached to this committee amendment.

It does not cost the taxpayer 1 penny. Moreover, it could, over the long run, lead the way to lifting the heavy burden of taxes from the backs of our people.

I say this because it is no secret that over 60 percent of the annual tax burden is attributed directly or indirectly to the threat posed to our survival and that of our allies by imperial Russia.

If the Russians were relieved of their imperial power by the process of internal political pressures leading to dismemberment of their empire, the threat to our survival would pass into history.

This is no idle hope. The signs of the times put the stamp of reality upon this prospect.

In recent weeks we have heard a great deal about the Moscow-Peiping dispute.

It is generally agreed that if this dispute is real and unhealable by Marxist magic, the Russians are in serious trouble.

Some observers even argue that the United States cannot stand on the sidelines of this dispute, that we must take sides and that imperial Russia would be easier to live with than an aggressive, expansive Red China.

This kind of loose and naive thinking is responsible for much of the trouble we find ourselves in today.

The facts are that the United States can reach no profitable or lasting agreement with either side engaged in this dispute.

Both are dedicated to burying us. They only disagree on the means to be used for the burial ceremony.

There are, nevertheless, increasing signs that the Moscow-Peiping dispute can ripen into circumstances leading to the political dismemberment of the Russian empire.

The Red Chinese have concealed their real quarrel with Moscow under heavy barrages of dialectical invective.

Stripped of all the doubletalk, what the Red Chinese are really demanding from the Russians is the status of equals in the international conspiracy and the corresponding abolition of Russian racial superiority in the affairs of international communism.

This hard and fixed discrimination within the Communist camp is even resented by non-Russian Communists in the European parts of the Russian empire.

The main difference is that the Red Chinese take added confidence from the vast population they control and are thus bolder about their demands. In the process they fan the fires of nationalism in the captive European nations.

Consequently, the imperial Russians find themselves completely surrounded by the fires of nationalism, that is, powerful human forces that regard communism to be nothing more than a clever cover operation for old-fashioned Russian imperialism.

This contest boils down, in terms of human resources, to some 90 million Russians against over 200 million captive

non-Russians in the European parts of their Empire and some 500 million Chinese in the Asiatic part of their Empire.

These odds cannot be ignored, even in the nuclear age.

It is worth noting the Red Chinese have expressed contempt for fear of a nuclear war.

This contempt in the context of Red Chinese ambitions to regain their territories in the Far East annexed by the czars makes for some interesting speculation.

The Red Chinese have the Russians in a tight bind in the Far East.

In terms of sheer manpower the Red Chinese have what it takes to regain their lost territories, now a part of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialistic Republic.

If the Russians use nuclear weapons to turn back Chinese military efforts to regain those territories, the condemnation of the world will be the Russian's reward.

If the Red Chinese initiate action against imperial Russia in the Far East, this is sure to bring a favorable response from the peoples of the captive European nations who will seize this opportunity to break their Russian colonial chains.

There are events of great international significance yet to unfold and this is surely no time to be rushing to the defense of imperial Russia.

The long-range effects of the committee amendment will, to a large extent, depend upon the exploitation given to it on a worldwide basis by the U.S. Information Agency, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberation.

I urge the able chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to take steps to make certain this is done.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDWIN

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: On page 15, line 2, after the period, add the following sentence:

"Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by striking out the second sentence reading: 'This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) Such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international Communism,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.'"

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House may recall that 2 years ago when the foreign aid bill was taken up in the House for consideration an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] to bar aid to any Communist country. That amendment was adopted by the House.

The purpose of my amendment is simply to restore the exact original wording of the Casey amendment. The amendment that was adopted 2 years ago was greatly watered down in the Senate. Last year an amendment was again offered

by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], exactly the same wording, but it was watered down by an amendment offered in the House that would allow a waiver under which aid could go to Communist countries.

I have voted for the foreign aid bill every year I have served in the Congress, but it seems to me the fact that aid has been given to Communist countries has done more to cause the people to have distrust in the foreign aid program than in the case of any other single feature of the program.

I have a tabulation as to the amount of aid given to Yugoslavia and Poland. The tabulation for the period from July 1945, to June 30, 1962, totals for Yugoslavia \$2,396,700,000, and for Poland \$522,600,000.

I am informed in this particular bill the State Department is not intending to allocate funds to Yugoslavia or Poland with the exception of certain funds for a hospital in Poland. Under the amendment adopted last year there is a specific exception in the case of hospitals. So my amendment will not change that. The provision for funds for a hospital in Poland would go for that particular purpose. But this amendment would bar any other aid under this bill to any Communist country, including Cuba, Yugoslavia, Poland, or any other Communist country.

It seems to me that we have to make a decision on principle. If we are opposed to the basic theory of communism, which is to overthrow our very way of life which our Government was set up to defend, then I do not see how, consistently with that principle, we can allow aid to be given to any communistic country under any circumstances, and the purpose of my amendment is to bar any such aid under any circumstances.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I want to thank the gentleman for complimenting me by endeavoring to restore this original language. I am still very strongly for this original language, but I must say in all fairness that since the House did adopt this amendment I have checked it, and the information furnished me by AID is that the only amount concerned in Yugoslavia since the adoption by this Congress of the amendment was around \$90,000 for the purpose of closing out the program. Like the gentleman, I am a little disturbed that there is that possibility in view of the ability to make the grants. As long as they can make the grants, there is always that possibility. The amount that the gentleman spoke of, prior to this House cutting it off we were sending \$415,000 a day to Yugoslavia alone. That is not peanuts.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to follow up the comments of the gentleman from Texas by stating that although the State Department has indicated they do not intend to allocate any funds to Yugoslavia and Poland, nevertheless, unless we write some restrictive provision in the bill this afternoon, they could do so. It seems to me we should indicate

clearly that no funds under this bill should go to any Communist country.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Will the gentleman tell me whether this amendment will permit the sale of Public Law 480 commodities?

Mr. BALDWIN. This amendment does not cover Public Law 480 commodities.

Mrs. KELLY. Then the gentleman is willing to have surplus goods under Public Law 480 to be given or sold to Communist countries? Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. No, I am not; but my amendment is to the pending foreign aid bill, and applies to the funds in that bill. I am offering an amendment to bar allowing foreign aid to go to a Communist country. I will be glad to support any amendment offered by anyone in this House to bar aid under Public Law 480, but the funds in this bill do not fall under the Public Law 480 program.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one has endeavored to cut off aid to Communist nations any more than I have. I should like to say that Public Law 480 in no way comes under the control of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I wish it did. Then we would not have the problem involved as far as the sale of Public Law 480 commodities is concerned. It is not in this bill, although an amendment to prohibit the sale of commodities under Public Law 480 could come under this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would like to include the sale of products under Public Law 480 at this time.

Mr. BALDWIN. In answer to the gentleman's question, this amendment is to a section of the bill dealing with the foreign aid program. Therefore, I have worded my amendment to bar aid under the foreign aid program. If any other Member of the House wants to offer an amendment barring aid under Public Law 480, I shall fully support that amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could arrive at some limitation on this debate. This amendment was debated last year fully on the floor, not 2 years ago, last year. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is that on this amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of this amendment, the gentleman from California, if I may have his attention, would this amendment bar the United States from giving assistance in an instance as we recently had, to the helpless and in-

nocent victims at Skopje who were victims of an earthquake?

Mr. BALDWIN. No, this would not bar that because that was under the Public Law 480 provision.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, the language of this amendment would not bar that kind of humanitarian assistance?

Mr. BALDWIN. It would not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I would like to query him or the gentleman from California further as to whether, or not, this would specifically bar aid given recently to the tune of some \$50 million by the Secretary of Agriculture while in that country.

Mr. BALDWIN. It would not bar that aid because that was not under the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HALL. Was that under Public Law 480?

Mr. BALDWIN. It was apparently not under the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HALL. Would it bar aid for a nuclear reactor to Yugoslavia under the technical assistance program?

Mr. BALDWIN. This amendment would bar any aid from any funds approved in the foreign aid bill. This would bar any aid from any fund under this act that we are authorizing today from going to any Communist country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to set the record straight in correcting a minor mistake here. The Casey amendment in the 1958 foreign aid bill, as I recall, was an amendment which specifically listed nations that were to be deprived of any aid; and further in looking at the amendment of the gentleman from California, I would not be satisfied with it if it qualifies the recipient as one which is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy. In the cases of Yugoslavia and Poland, the question arises as to whether the country is, in fact, controlled by the international Communist conspiracy. I would much prefer to see this amendment read, "any nation with a Communist government." Then we would not be playing with words as to whether or not the country is controlled by the so-called international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. The wording that you read is the wording that is being stricken out by this amendment. The wording you read is the wording now in the bill that is being stricken out and replaced by wording that simply bars any aid to any Communist country.

Mr. COLLIER. I understand that but I do find the reference to a Communist government.

Mr. BALDWIN. No, it amends section 620(f) which says, "Any Communist country." It is on page 73 of the committee report.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman. If that is it, I thank the gentleman. I am satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there has from time to time during the discussion on this bill come up a very complicated situation with regard to the relationship of Public Law 480 to the foreign assistance legislation. I have tried for some time to determine what this relationship is and I have not been able to do so after months of attempts.

I would just like to point out at this point, however, to the gentleman from California, that with regard to Poland and Yugoslavia, other than military assistance primarily to Yugoslavia, a very large percentage of the aid given has been under Public Law 480, not directly under development loans or grants under the Foreign Assistance Act or the old Mutual Security Act. I agree with him that we should take every means to see to it that we do not give any more aid to a country that is directly, through its people, aligned with the Communist bloc countries. It is true, of course, that both Yugoslavia and Poland are in this area, but I want him to remember that there is a difference—and it is something we very often forget—there is a difference between a government ruling over people where they have no choice and where they are a militarily occupied country. This does not indicate that the people have lost their intense desire and determination for independence. The people of Poland deserve every possible help we can give to aid them to regain their freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, there are several reasons why I oppose this amendment. First of all, I think the original author of the amendment [Mr. CASEY] has stated that the administration has demonstrated good faith in the use of the authority that presently appears. Second, the language that we have in the bill is the product of bipartisan support, and it took considerable time to work out this bipartisan language when this bill was before the House last year. Third, I think we are living in historic times where the Communist world is breaking up and to deny the flexibility that the President has to exploit these cracks is to do a serious disservice to our national interest.

Fourth, in adopting this amendment, we question the judgment of our President. We would also question the judgment of former President Eisenhower who supports the language as it presently exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. As I told the author of this amendment, I intend to support the amendment, but I also want to explain why I do not offer an amendment to re-

store the original words, because there has been no aid since Congress worked its will the last time. But I do want to correct the gentleman over here. Do not kid yourself that we have not been pouring money into Yugoslavia in dollars, because we have. I have a nice fat list here that I will be glad to show you if you want to see it. For 15 years, \$415,000 a day, for 15 years, in Yugoslavia alone. I have an amendment coming up here a little while later which is not as controversial as this one we are now talking about which we had last year where we spent over 3 hours on this little amendment alone. However, do not kid yourself that we have not been fattening up some of our enemies.

I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment. You can do whatever you want to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first let me give you the history of the Casey amendment that is now in the bill, which the gentleman from California is proposing to eliminate by his amendment. Last year after the Senate disagreed with the House on this provision, the President called a meeting at the White House with Members from both sides of the House in attendance. We devised this language, which is now in the law, at that time. The language that the gentleman from California is now trying to eliminate is the language that was devised by the late and beloved Congressman Francis Walter. You may remember Francis Walter took the well in defense of this language. This language specifically gives the President a right to make a determination. Are we going to trust the President or not? This language has been in the bill all this year.

There has not been any attempt by the President to give any aid to Yugoslavia or Poland under this authority. There is no money in this bill for fiscal 1964, either for Poland or for Yugoslavia. This amendment does not touch Public Law 480. If you really want to write a restrictive amendment you should amend Public Law 480 under which we are selling millions of dollars' worth of farm products to both Poland and Yugoslavia. No money under the Mutual Security Bill is going there, so we do not need this amendment to put a further restriction on the President.

Those who vote for this amendment are saying to the President of the United States, "I do not trust you."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the bulk of the aid that the gentleman from Texas refers to was not given equally over a period of 15 years. The bulk of the aid to Poland and Yugoslavia was given during the Eisenhower administration; and I am not being political when I say that because I supported Mr. Eisenhower's right to do it. But I will tell you what this amendment will do. If this amendment passes, and there is a Hungarian type revolution in Latvia,

Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Yugoslavia or anyplace else and it is on a shaky basis and has a fighting chance to succeed, we would be prohibited from helping it to succeed. That would be the effect of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The question as taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 158.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 306. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

"(j) No assistance under this Act shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is in the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this Act."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed \$100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, has that section that is now sought to be amended been read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 306 was read.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would require additional congressional authorization for any overseas productive enterprise in which total U.S. assistance reaches \$100 million or more.

Further, this amendment would remain on the books only until the enactment of next year's foreign aid bill.

There are a number of reasons why I have offered this amendment, but all of these reasons, in one way or another, hinge upon U.S. participation in the proposed Bokaro steel plant in India.

The committee spent considerable time in the hearings on this proposed plant. We questioned Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, closely on this project.

We had the benefit of the United States Steel report on the feasibility of this project.

After all the information which was given to us about this project, after all our discussions on Bokaro, I could not help coming away with one overriding observation.

That is this: What we do not know about Bokaro far outweighs what we do know.

The plain fact is that nobody knows whether Bokaro is possible, whether Bokaro is feasible, whether it can be operated economically, whether manpower can be found to run the plant once it is completed, whether adequate transportation can be provided for raw materials, if such raw materials are available in the kinds and quantities necessary for this plant.

Further, nobody knows whether or not there are private funds available in either India, in our own country, in Western Europe, to finance construction of this plant or whether the Government of India should run this plant.

I do not think that Congress, at this point, has the information available to it to make a determination of how much or what kind of contribution our Federal Government should make, if any.

Further, the Agency for International Development admits that the data is not available to it at this time to make a rational decision on the role our Federal Government should play in this project.

The United States Steel report raises some grave doubts about the availability of limestone deposits, for instance, and points out that those deposits which are known are of inferior quality.

Where the 5,400 workers would live, where the necessary technicians would come from and who they would be has not been adequately considered.

The United States Steel report points out that living conditions at the proposed Bokaro site would be very difficult for the Indians themselves, and even more difficult for any American technicians who would have to live in the vicinity.

One of the main purposes of my amendment is to forestall an agreement before the data has been obtained, before the gaps in current information are filled.

The statement has been made that there are not enough private funds available in India, the free world, and the United States to permit this plant to be built as a private enterprise project.

I have serious doubts about the validity of this statement.

Most certainly, private capital has not come forth in sufficient quantities to date to finance this project under the private sector.

The reason is quite obvious. On the basis of the data which has been supplied up until today, I most certainly would not invest a nickel in this project. I do not believe a businessman in India would do so either.

After the necessary surveys have been completed—after a close look has been taken at this project in terms of the amount of private capital available—after the geologic surveys have been completed—after a determination has been made that this plant is the best possible investment of funds to raise living standards in India, then is the time for another look at this project in terms of how it should be financed—through private capital, through a public corporation or possibly some combination of both.

While the Agency for International Development, the State Department and other Federal agencies have attempted to assure us that no commitment will be made on Bokaro during the current fiscal year, this is not enough assurance for me.

The temptation might be too great to use approval of Bokaro as a possible short-term replacement for foreign policy in the subcontinent. I most certainly would deplore the approval of this project under such circumstances, and I am sure that I would be joined by almost every Member of the House of Representatives in this.

My amendment would cover only Bokaro at this time. The reason I have proposed roughly a year's limit in the amendment is so that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will have an opportunity during the next 12 months to determine just exactly what role Congress should play in the approval and consideration of future overseas programs.

We have spent a number of months in committee in our deliberations on the total foreign aid bill. I think the committee, in general, did an excellent job.

But I think it is easy for my colleagues to recognize the fact that a great deal more study, a great deal more consideration must be given to the voice Congress should have in the approval of individual projects in which substantial amounts of U.S. dollars are involved.

It is my belief that the committee will have the time for adequate consideration of this role of Congress in these determinations under less-hurried, less-hurried circumstances.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman and I worked on the amendment with reference to Indonesia at great length. This is one of the amendments I referred to earlier I would support. I think the gentleman's amendment does exactly what needs to be done.

Personally, at the moment I would be against the project, period, but at least I would be willing to grant a year to make a study and have a chance to come in and convince the committee. This amendment means they cannot proceed with this or give a dime before next year's foreign aid bill, unless the House and the Senate separately voted to let them go ahead. The committee has examined the amendment. The chairman and I have discussed it at length, and I believe—the chairman can correct me if I am wrong—I am authorized to say that we on this side accept the amendment and hope that it passes.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: On page 16, insert the following new section after line 8:

"Sec. 307. From the date of enactment of this Act through June 30, 1964, no part of any funds authorized to be made available for carrying out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available to partially or wholly finance in any country, either by loan, grant, or otherwise, participation by the United States in the acquisition, construction, or expansion of any separately identifiable project or facility proposal involving for completion an estimated aggregate limit of United States participation, as determined by the President, of \$100,000,000 or more unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms either in this Act or in other legislation enacted by the Congress; and after June 30, 1964, no appropriation or other funds shall be made available for any such participation in any such project or facility proposal, otherwise authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and involving for completion an estimated aggregate limit of United States participation, as determined by the President, of \$50,000,000 or more unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms by legislation enacted by the Congress.

"The provisions of this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this or any other Act."

And amend subsequent section numbers accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment I have offered may sound complicated, but it is not. There is nothing complex about it.

It provides that from the date of enactment of this act and through June 30, next year, none of the funds made available for carrying out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act shall be available to finance in whole or part, in any country, any project in which the United States is involved and which costs in the estimated aggregate \$100 million or more, unless such project is specifically authorized in this act or in other legislation enacted by Congress.

After June 30, 1964, no funds shall be made available for any project or facility, involving for completion an estimated

aggregate of \$50 million, again as determined by the President, unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms by legislation enacted by Congress.

This amendment will not only block the spending by this Government of an estimated \$1 billion on the Bokaro steel mill, but it will stop any other commitments of this kind without the specific authorization of Congress.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], is temporary in nature. I want to make this permanent. Why should not the Congress pass upon the use of our dollars to build the Bokaro steel mill in India, and they will under the terms of my amendment. But why should this same scrutiny not go to all other projects between now and next June, if there are such projects, that cost \$100 million, and thereafter why should not the Congress authorize projects costing more than \$50 million or more?

Why, you cannot get in your district a project costing \$50,000, you cannot even get planning money for it, unless you get an authorization from the Congress. Why should we permit the bureaucrats, under the Foreign Assistance Act to launch even \$50 million projects in foreign countries without the authority of Congress?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman feel we might be starting a system here or a precedent under which we would be lobbied to death by the lobbies from downtown representing the foreign governments trying to put over projects?

Mr. GROSS. Well, why should we fear lobbyists—any of them?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of fear, it is a question of getting into an area in which I do not think the gentleman wants the Congress to get. When a local project is considered by the Congress, it is considered on the basis of local requirements. But when we consider one of these foreign projects, we are going to have to get into the whole field of foreign policy which is outside of the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman for just a minute or two.

Mr. McDOWELL. I will not take that long, I assure the gentleman. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I would expect that.

Mr. McDOWELL. But I do want to commend him, for he is certainly making progress. He comes from nothing to \$50 million very quickly.

Mr. GROSS. What do you mean—from nothing to \$50 million?

Mr. McDOWELL. I thought the gentleman was opposed to any aid.

Mr. GROSS. If it is so insignificant why are you opposed to it?

Mr. McDOWELL. I thought the gentleman was opposed to any aid whether it is 50 cents or \$50 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am not authorizing any aid here. I am saying that when

the bureaucratic "foreign aiders" want to start a project costing more than \$50 million for some foreign dictator after next June 30, 1964, they have got to come to the Congress and justify it. What is wrong with that? You cannot get any part of that kind of money in your district or your State without coming to Congress and justifying it. And since when, I ask, has Congress been precluded from authorizing expenditures and appropriating for them even though this action may have an effect on foreign policy?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. They are going to borrow this money. This is a loan. This is not a project such as we get in this country where we get a grant. This is an actual loan and they are going to pay interest on this loan.

Mr. GROSS. Well, so what? Maybe the loan will never be repaid. Maybe for lack of proper scrutiny the project is so infeasible that it can never pay out.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is a member now on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and he has made a very valuable member of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. I have enjoyed working with the gentleman since the first of the year.

Mr. GROSS. And I might say this amendment is not accompanied by a State Department position paper.

Mr. MORGAN. I know it was not. But I want to say, the gentleman will admit that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has had a good many meetings since February. We have been in session 4 and 5 days a week. But if we ever get an amendment like this, it will put us in the public works business and we will be up there from 9 o'clock in the morning until 12 o'clock at night hearing the projects one by one. It will make the Committee on Foreign Affairs a public works committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman limit his request to 2 minutes and I will not object?

Mr. GROSS. Then I will make it 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Here are some of the projects that are going on: Road construction in Afghanistan, \$54,200,000.

That famous fertilizer plant in Korea, \$50 million.

The Vietnam highway and bridge construction, \$53,900,000.

There is a long list. I do not have time to read it all. But why in the name of conscience should not the Congress of the United States pass on these projects involving hundreds of millions? I do not agree with the gentleman that it is going to impose an undue burden

on the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I thought we were selected to come down here and work?

Mr. MORGAN. It certainly will put an undue burden upon the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including the gentleman in the well.

Mr. GROSS. When the foreign hand-out artists come in with \$50 million projects, I promise you I will be on the job. I will be your little servant when they come to the committee with projects costing \$50 million and \$100 million. I will be delighted to work early and late to save the citizens of this country even a few of the millions now going down the drain through this global give-away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am in favor of the Broomfield amendment. I want to say too that Mr. BROOMFIELD worked out what I considered to be an excellent amendment on Indonesia, which I helped to write in the bill in committee. But I think we have to be reasonable about this, and I hope I can appeal to some of the gentleman's colleagues to vote for his amendment because it bars the Bokaro steel mill until the next foreign-aid bill comes up. If they come in with any proof at all, I am willing so far as I am concerned for them to submit it to the committee.

I do not think there is anything they can say that is going to get me to be for that project, but I am willing for them to submit their arguments. I think the Broomfield amendment is a reasonable amendment. I think if we live with it for a year and it works, I do not think we will have any trouble writing it in for another year. But what are you doing in this amendment? The gentleman says it is permanent, and that is right. I know Members on my left and I are going to disagree about our hopes for 1964. You hope you are going to win the Presidency. The gentlemen's amendment, if that happens, will only affect us for 6 months, but you will have to live with it, and I guarantee that your President, if you should elect one, whoever he is, will not like that kind of handcuffing. That is the substance of his amendment. I ask you to vote this down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I will be glad to.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the Defense Department and various branches of the Service have to come before the Committee on Appropriations and before the Armed Services Legislative Committee to build even a glorified latrine?

Mr. HAYS. I have news for the gentleman. The foreign aid people have to come before the Passman subcommittee to build even an unglorified latrine; just a plain old common one.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the gentleman is quite right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend? The Chair suggests that we raise the debate level just a little.

Mr. HAYS. I am for that. So will the gentleman suggest some other kind of building, and I will go along with it.

Mr. GROSS. If there is justification for congressional approval of projects involving an outlay of \$100 million in order to get at the Bokaro steel mill, if it is good to do it in that case, then why is it not justified in all other foreign aid projects costing \$100 million?

Mr. HAYS. Because the gentleman is not doing it in \$100 million cases. After next year he is reducing it by 100 percent down to \$50 million.

Mr. GROSS. And why not?

Mr. HAYS. Because I do not think it is good business. I think that it is too restrictive. I do not think it gives enough flexibility. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has written a reasonable amendment, and I hope that the committee will support the Broomfield amendment and defeat the Gross amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will deliberately address myself to the Members on this side of the aisle, in the presumption that my words would not have much influence on that side of the aisle. Therefore, since I am addressing people who are normally friends, I am going to be very frank. I would like to say this: Boys and girls, let us get together. This is what we should do. BILL BROOMFIELD worked up a good, practical, sensible amendment. As a matter of fact, it is a perfect amendment, because no one should object to it, not even the diplomats in the Indian Government, because it is not aimed at them. All it states is the fact that next year any project that runs over \$100 million must have specific congressional approval. Having done this, there is no reason in the world why we should degenerate this into a debate on an item which is \$50 million less, or go off on any other tangent. If we have proposed and received the acceptance of a good, sound plan, why should we do anything else? It is late in the day. When we had the conflicting amendments and substitutes on the Cuban situation, if all the paper had been lumped together, we could have piled it on the island and it would have sunk. I do not like to see this situation degenerate into that much confusion and that much unnecessary conflict. I think the Broomfield amendment as proposed deserves the support of the entire House. It will certainly be understood downtown. It is understood and appreciated by people on both sides of the aisle, on and off the committee. Let us start moving. Let us take the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, just so that the gentleman will not feel he is not without friends on the other side and feel lonely in the well, I support the gentleman's position. I feel that the record also should be clear that the Congress is not at this time rejecting the Bokaro project. What it is doing is

withholding and deferring that judgment until all the feasibility reports are in and that will be, we have been assured by the time of the consideration of the bill next year. So I compliment the gentleman from Michigan and hope that his amendment will be supported.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I direct one remark to my dear friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], with whom I never want to disagree, although in this case I must. He told us that the Broomfield amendment was imperfect because it was temporary. The gentleman knows there is not anything temporary once we in Washington set it up. So the Broomfield philosophy will be permanent.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my very real appreciation of the work that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has done on this amendment. It happens that I have followed it very closely. I am convinced that he has brought us something that is very workable. We know there are a great many problems in the Indian situation. This does not hit that on the head but it says that we must really consult over such enormous projects as \$100 million. I hope very sincerely that this Committee will vote for the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman kindly provide the House with a definition of the two words "productive enterprise"? This refers to any project dealing with a productive enterprise. What is a productive enterprise?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am afraid I can tell you more about unproductive enterprises. Most of us have dabbled in those.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, there is, I take it, no doubt of the basic U.S. interest in aiding India. It is very much in our own national interest. We are helping by far the largest of the free world nations—450 million persons; more than all of Africa and Latin America combined—and we are helping it develop under democratic institutions, at a critical time in a critical area of the world. The Indians are on the front-line of the free world confrontation with communism.

It also seems clear that there is a real need for domestic steel production in India. I understand that India badly needs more steelmaking capacity for her own domestic requirements. I am told that even if all five existing steel mills are expanded as presently planned, and if the Bokaro steel mill were built, India's economy by 1976 would still require something like 2 million tons more steel than could be produced in India.

Thus, given a genuine U.S. interest in encouraging India's economic development, and given an urgent need to expand substantially India's steelmaking capacity, it seems to me that our prob-

lem in the United States is to determine what is the right way for the United States to help meet this need.

It appears to me that a further examination of this whole problem is in order. Bokaro would be one answer to the question of how the United States can help. U.S. AID Director David Bell has told us that he has made no decision on Bokaro as yet and that he does not intend to make any decision until he has received and studied the answers to many as yet unanswered questions. He has agreed to consult with our Foreign Affairs Committee before reaching any decision and indicated that this could not in any event be before next January.

I agree with Mr. Bell that he should not make a decision until all the facts are in. I welcome his readiness to consult further with the Congress before reaching any decision. In fact, I would go further and say that the whole problem of India's steelmaking capacity and the role of U.S. assistance—not just the question of Bokaro—needs additional study.

If further study is needed both for Bokaro and for the whole problem of Indian steel-producing capacity, I think it would obviously be wrong for us to adopt an amendment which would bar any U.S. aid for Bokaro at any time. I think it would be wrong for us to do this when all the facts have not been ascertained and when studies of these problems are currently going forward. I think it would be wrong to adopt such an amendment, which would in fact prejudice the issue and amount to a decision before the circumstances on which the decision must be based are all known.

On the other hand, I see no objection to an amendment which would insure further congressional opportunity to review a proposal such as Bokaro. It is by its very size in a special situation; the Congress has a legitimate reason for paying special attention to proposals of such magnitude. I thus support the proposal to amend the aid bill by providing that development loans of over \$100 million for productive enterprises be subject to specific congressional review in fiscal year 1964.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE to the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: At the end of the Broomfield amendment add the following:

"No funds authorized by this or any other Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, may be used directly or indirectly in connection with the Bokaro steel mill in India."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this very specific amendment, I am hoping to gain assurances that the American taxpayer will not be rushed into making what could become a disastrous investment.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that I carefully used the word "rushed" and I mean to state clearly that I am con-

vinced, after examining all phases of the Bokaro situation that—at this stage of uncertainty—there is no clear justification for the United States entering into this agreement at this time with the Indian Government.

All during the past weeks, Mr. Chairman, I have been locked in executive session with four distinguished colleagues of my House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, a special group selected by our chairman for the express purpose of examining the Bokaro steel mill proposals. We have heard many experts, including returning U.S. Ambassador to India, John Galbraith, Gen. Lucius Clay, Norman Obbard, the executive vice president of United States Steel, representatives of the U.S. Steelworkers Union, and others.

I mention the names of these distinguished gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, only for the purpose of saying in all sincerity that they did not show sufficient cause for the immediate construction of this mill.

The comprehensive United States Steel report—which, incidentally, cost the American taxpayers \$686,000—left serious doubts in my mind as to the feasibility of this project. Now I have spoken on this floor innumerable times in behalf of our foreign aid program and I am a powerful supporter of the program, when I can be convinced that the program is sound.

In no instance, Mr. Speaker, can I justify this steel mill going into a nation that has received approximately \$11 billion from the United States since 1945.

The United States Steel report study—to be specific—stated that it would be 2 full years or more before a satisfactory long-term solution can be found to the basic raw material problem that exists in the Nation.

Are we going to go ahead during this fiscal year with that fact in mind?

And how about some other well-known problems, to skip over for a while the fantastic financial agreement that we would be entering into.

For example, the fact that an entire new city would have to be built, with the construction of new canals, dams, and railroad tracks.

The United States Steel report also says that it takes 3 years to train a foreman for a project such as this—and 3 to 4 years for apprentice and skilled maintenance men.

With these outstanding problems a genuine hindrance to the beginning construction of the mill, I think that it will be clear to the Members of this House that we cannot appropriate funds during this fiscal year for such a hastily conceived project.

Another factor is this—the United States has over 100,000 people unemployed who are steelworkers, at the same time that we are importing 5½ million tons of steel mainly from Japan and Belgium. No one has been able to give the assurance that there will be a significant change in steel unemployment in the United States. Production of 5½ million tons in the United States incidentally, means that 20,000 of those

U.S. steelworkers who are unemployed could be working.

Before I go into the features, or I should say the drawbacks of the U.S. loan, I want to shatter the myth of those that say the Soviet-financed mill in India is justification for our going in and building this one at this time.

Their steel mill was financed by a 12-year loan from the Soviets at a 2.5-percent interest, repayable in hard currency, at a total amount of \$136 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues who are suspicious of the entire U.S. foreign aid program would be down here on the floor fighting for a similar loan.

Our loan, on the other hand, would amount to almost a billion dollars, a sizable chunk of the \$1.8 billion expected cost of the mill. This would be in the form of a 40-year development credit loan, with a 10-year grace period. Our interest will be three-fourths of 1 percent. Through long experience with these development credit loans, we can be certain that we will not get too much of this money back.

In other words, we will give India about a billion dollars. The Indian Government will then form a corporation to build the mill. India will lend money to the corporation at 5¼-percent interest, not overlooking the fact that for every ton of steel made in India there is a charge of \$52 a ton. In toto, this means that the Indian Government will realize, over a 20-year period, out of our \$1 billion alone, about \$5.5 billion.

Furthermore, we will be lucky to even receive a million dollars out of the billion that we contribute.

There will also be powerful competition to sell them steel at a cheaper rate than we can sell it to India.

There is no guarantee, either, that would prevent the Indians from buying cheaper steel from the other steel-producing countries who could sell to them at a cheaper rate. That is to say, if they still have need for steel even above and beyond what Bokaro would produce.

For example, Japan could sell India a ton of steel for \$102 at dockside. It would cost India \$174 for a ton of steel at dockside from the United States.

We know who would get the orders.

This would not be a bonanza for the U.S. steel industry by any means. It would not, in truth, be a bonanza for anyone except the Indian Government.

It would not be fair to the American taxpayers to go ahead with this big sum of foreign aid, Mr. Speaker, when there are so many untenables.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this looks like a dangerous and serious proposition from every angle. We cannot expect to receive the support of the American people for those provisions of the foreign aid program that are so essential to the national welfare if we jump into a project such as this.

Remember that old phrase by Bulwer-Lytton, "Business dispatched is business well done, but business hurried is business ill done," and also that statement by the famous New Englander, Emerson,

"Never lose your presence of mind, and never get hurried."

This is a hurried project, Mr. Speaker, and the House will do well to pass my amendment which will hold all funds for fiscal year 1964 from Bokaro. Given this extra time, and the necessary dispatch and deliberation that is so essential in our pressing times, we will be able to arrive at the sensible and practical solution to the problem.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. For which amendment is the gentleman? Is the gentleman for the Gross or the Broomfield amendment?

Mr. CONTE. My amendment is an amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. I support the Broomfield amendment with my amendment specifying the Bokaro steel mill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for a brief question.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to say that I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and to further state that I am for the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama also at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I want to compliment the chairman of our special panel that was set up to study this Bokaro steel mill. The gentleman from Alabama did an excellent job and I am sure when this report is released to the Members of Congress, the Members will see the arduous work and the time and the effort put in by the chairman and the members of that subcommittee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman ought to lock himself up and study this some more or not. We have been studying it and we have not been locked up. The gentleman from Michigan has been studying it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] has been studying it. I do not know whether this is an attempt to get two names on the amendment or not, but the Broomfield amendment barred this for a year. That is the extent of it. As a matter of fact, the feasibility reports which we studied, offered by the United States Steel Co., say in so much plain, unmitigated English, that we are not prepared to say this project is feasible until a further study is made of the iron ore resources and the coal resources.

All of this has been studied. The Broomfield amendment proposed to do exactly this. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] made a good speech, I am glad he got to read it, but about all it did was to reiterate the fact that the Broomfield amendment is right.

The gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has been working on it a long time, and we ought to support his

amendment. If there is any credit in it, I am willing to give it to him.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Since the gentleman referred to the gentleman from Michigan as having studied the subject for a long time—

Mr. HAYS. I also said you had studied it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman. As a student of the issue may I state that the Broomfield amendment does exactly what the House obviously wants to do, therefore the Conte amendment is not necessary, and I suggest that we adopt the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have somebody, I do not care whether on the right or left—perhaps my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], can answer a question. Let me read this provision in the Broomfield amendment:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed \$100 million.

What is a productive enterprise?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman wants a definition of the language he should have directed his question to the gentleman from New Jersey. The point here is the intention of the amendment, which is always the key. The intention of the amendment is to prohibit any participation in any development of any project where the total cost would exceed \$100 million.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that the intention of this amendment is to go first to the Bokaro steel mill, and nothing else. That is because he cannot define what constitutes a productive enterprise in any other terms than the Bokaro steel mill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. "Productive enterprise," as I understand the amendment, is any enterprise which produces any usable article except hot air, and I do not mean this in any way to reflect on the distinguished gentleman from Iowa who is always succinct and to the point.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me, as I hope, an old friend of his, to make the observation that he is winning a victory and he does not realize it. Once having established this precedent, once having started it, we have set the stage for future practical amendments of this type.

Mr. GROSS. But I want to apply the same scrutiny to any other number of

projects costing \$50 million and more—I want to apply the same rule to them.

Apparently no one wants to give me a definition of "productive enterprise," in relation to the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I had a similar amendment at the desk. While I support the Broomfield amendment I think it should be more specific and get directly to the core of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment and the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts are one and the same thing. It is aimed specifically at prohibiting the assistance of this Government in financing the construction of the contemplated Bokaro Steel plant in India. It says simply that no aid shall be furnished under this act for construction of a steel plant at Bokaro, India, or elsewhere in India.

As we all know, this proposed project would, in the final analysis, entail approximately a billion dollars. This money would be raised by taxing the citizens of this country together with the institutions of private enterprise to be used to construct a mill that would be owned and operated by the Indian Government in direct competition with private enterprise. This, in my opinion, would certainly enhance the cause of world socialism and is contrary to the best interests of this Nation and its taxpayers.

Tuesday, the steelworkers, through their union representative, were asking the President for help against steel imports—imports are now pouring in at rates of 5 million tons annually representing a loss of 37,700 full-time steelworkers' jobs. Yet, these same employees are going to be taxed to build a plant in India that conceivably will produce steel to compete against our own steel producers. Private enterprise cannot compete against a socialized plant particularly when it is financed with our money. Furthermore, our tax structure and high wage scale add to the burden of production costs. These facts, coupled with the fact that the cost of production under free enterprise includes the amortization of the investment outlay to construct a plant and such cost is seldom reflected in production costs of a socialized or government-owned plant, make it practically impossible to compete favorably against such a foreign competitor using extremely cheap labor. This is a bitter pill for the steelworkers and the steel industry to swallow, particularly when they realize their own tax dollars may be used to eliminate their jobs.

It is interesting to note that AID Director, David E. Bell, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee in April of this year, that India was 1 of the 10 nations that has produced substantial economic growth and adequate progress, limiting needs for external assistance.

India already has received one of the largest slices of U.S. foreign aid without the Bokaro plant and is presently seeking a 3-year commitment from Western Powers for a military buildup estimated to entail one and one-third billion dollars in foreign exchange assistance, much of which will fall upon the United States. The well will soon run dry. It is interesting to note that while India is willing to accept our assistance with both hands, she is now reneging on an agreement to transmit Voice of America broadcasts to Southeast Asia even though we are furnishing the transmitting facilities. Obviously, India is willing to "receiveth but not giveth."

Furthermore, there are serious technical difficulties which as yet are not resolved to the satisfaction of some of us. As I understand it, United States Steel, the concern making the study as to the feasibility of the project, has indicated that insufficient consideration has been given so far to the availability of raw materials for the plant, and, further, has indicated that it would take 2 years or more to find a long-term solution. How ridiculous it would be to construct a plant that would have insufficient raw materials to serve the plant's requirements.

Mr. Chairman, to emphasize this point, I quote directly from the report of AID of March 1963:

It became apparent to us at an early stage in our investigation that wholly insufficient consideration was being given to the raw materials aspect of the Bokaro project. This deficiency appears to be due primarily to the fact that present plans are for the three principal raw materials to be supplied by three separate government entities. No individual or group with overall steelmaking raw materials experience has been made responsible for coordinating Bokaro's raw materials program. We do not believe that any modern integrated steel project should be undertaken today in any country without such coordination of raw materials planning.

Other problems facing the feasibility of the project are inadequately trained personnel to operate the plant. Some 5,400 employees would have to be specifically trained to operate the plant. This would require additional expenditures.

Other costs involved would be for the construction of a dam and canal to Bokaro, a town would have to be constructed together with adequate power facilities. The United States Steel study stated:

Unless transportation, power, and water facilities are available in accordance with the assumptions made in this report, the operation and economic success of a Bokaro steel plant would be seriously affected.

The facts are that adequate power, water, and transportation facilities and labor supply are not available at this time.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the report which states that a successful plant at Bokaro requires that: First, qualified personnel, Indian and American, be assured; second, supplies of important raw materials be available and brought under ownership con-

trol of Bokaro management; third, provision be made for (a) adequate rail transport, (b) adequate supplies of power and water, (c) expansion of coal mining and washing facilities, (d) adequate area highways, and (e) a townsite to support both laborers and managers.

The report further says:

The Bokaro area has virtually no useful labor supply except in lowest categories. It is rural, remote and poorly served by transport facilities. It is unattractive to the great majority of potential Indian employees, who would come from elsewhere. "The situation is even worse as regards American employees * * * and would make it difficult to attract good expatriate personnel." Thus a nearby townsite must be built and operated, including medical, recreational, educational and shopping facilities, transport to and from the plant, and better access to the outside.

While these are compelling reasons in my judgment why the loan should not be made, the most compelling reason is our unfavorable balance-of-payments situation.

As we all well know, our balance-of-payments deficit ran considerably more than a billion dollars for the second quarter of this year—Department of Commerce figures. At this rate, our balance-of-payments deficit could reach an alltime high. I realize the administration has offered suggestions and measures to halt this outflow of our gold, and for that I commend the administration. The fact remains that the outflow has not halted and unless there is some drastic change, I fear the only solution is to devalue the dollar. We can say what we may about the balance-of-payments deficit, but we all know it is directly related to our largess. Excessive foreign aid is one of the reasons we have this unfavorable balance of payments and unless it is curtailed, the situation will become aggravated instead of alleviated.

We are already tottering on the brink of technical bankruptcy and repudiation. The stability of the dollar is threatened. The arithmetic is simple and unassailable.

Under existing Federal Reserve legislation, \$12.3 billion in gold is required to support our internal currency and credit structure. An additional \$500 million is required under recent legislation replacing outstanding silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes. This makes a total reserve requirement of \$12.8 billion in gold. The total gold stock is now \$15.6 billion, thus leaving free reserves of around \$2.8 billion. But these so-called free reserves are not actually free.

Chargeable against this gold reserve is some \$25.3 billion in short-term credits now in the hands of foreign governments. These short-term credits are redeemable from our gold supplies or reserves. Should foreigners continue to call our gold—as I said we lost more than \$1 billion during the second quarter of this year—the demand could not be met. The structure of the free world currency is built around the dollar. If this fails, chaos results. The situation is very grave.

This project is certainly one that would adversely affect the outflow of

gold and the deficit in our balance of payments. Congress could stem this outflow by restricting this unnecessary, unjustified venture.

This country simply does not have the billion dollars to put into this project.

I urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but I wish to say to the Committee I was one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who in committee voted against the Broomfield amendment. The reason I voted against the Broomfield amendment was because it was specifically at that time directed against the Bokaro plant, and I did not want to be in a position of putting my name on a matter of such great consequence to a country that looks upon the Bokaro steel plant as a prestigious event, insofar as their future is concerned. The Russians have given them a steel mill. They are looking to us and they want assistance in this regard.

The last point I wish to make is that I now support the Broomfield amendment. I think it would be a great mistake to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would again subject the Congress to the many, many attempts as in the past to the kind of lobbying we suffered under the Philippine bill. That should be testimony enough as to why we should vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, without regard to the question of how any Member feels with respect to the Broomfield amendment or the Gross amendment, certainly, it seems to me that on the Conte amendment the adoption of that amendment would be most unwise. I think it is unwise to pick out and name a particular country. I doubt if the situation was reversed, where legislation of this kind was pending before the legislative body of some other country, and if we were in the position of India, that we would feel pleased and happy if the United States was specifically named in this way. So without regard to the \$50 million or the \$100 million amendments, it seems to me that the Conte amendment, no matter what our party affiliation might be, but so far as our country is concerned, we would be directly injecting ourselves into another country and it would be offensive to that other country. As between the Gross amendment and the Broomfield amendment, we are accepting the Broomfield amendment, without reservation, not for the purpose of then voting against it but to accept the amendment that has been worked out as a very happy compromise.

I join with the chairman of the committee, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], and with other Members in urging the defeat of the Conte amendment for the specific reason I mentioned, as well as the defeat of the Gross amendment, because I think the Broomfield amendment is a fair adjustment between the membership of the committee and the leadership on both sides.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the author of the amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to comment and thank the Speaker very much for his observations, and also to point out it is very obvious no one here in the House can say whether India deserves a steel mill at the present time. The United States Steel report was inconclusive after 2 years of investigation. The AID agency made it very plain that they are not ready to make a judgment. What we are really doing is deferring the thing and giving Congress an opportunity to review it in another year. I hope we can stay with the amendment, because it is a sound approach to the problem.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here now for 3 days listening to debate on this very important bill. I think that the Members who participated have all made a very significant contribution. But it is obvious that even the members of the committee are divided on many proposals in the bill. We now have three amendments before us. We have the Broomfield amendment, the Gross amendment, and the Conte amendment; each representing different views. I think this has been a very stimulating experience we have had here in the last 3 days. But I do not think the American people are too deeply concerned as to whether or not we are going to adopt the Broomfield amendment, the Gross amendment, or the Conte amendment. I think that the average man on the street wants to know how much is all this going to cost. With this thought in mind, I think that we are somewhat in the wrong church and in the wrong pew on this debate. I shall vote for this bill. I shall support the authorization bill because it merely spells out the guidelines; the appropriation bill is yet to come. The President already has reduced the bill by \$450 million. The committee has trimmed it an additional \$400 million. If the Appropriations Subcommittee runs true to form, as it has during the last few years, it is reasonable to assume that there will be at least another additional \$1 billion cut in the appropriation for mutual assistance in 1964. This would mean that before final action is taken on the appropriation for foreign aid next year, we in the House will have cut the expenditure by almost \$2 billion.

I think many of the questions that have been debated and argued here today are going to be resolved only when we have an opportunity to vote on the appropriation measure. For that reason it is my hope that we can move along

with this bill today and then get to the real issue before the American people; namely, what will it cost.

I have recently asked the people in my district whether they favor continuing military and economic assistance to our allies if we make sure that all of the waste has been eliminated. A majority said "Yes." Because the Appropriations Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has reduced previous appropriations by a billion dollars, I feel confident that if there is any waste in this bill the Appropriations Committee will take adequate steps to remove it. There are many good things in this bill. Our Nation's effort to shield South America from communism contained in this bill is worthy of our support. Our efforts to help our allies build up their economy, so they can resist communism is also worthy of our support. There are many other good provisions in this bill. But there are also some questionable projects which I am confident will be eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

Therefore, let us move along with this measure.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I see only one Member on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious to vote as anybody else and I know how I am going to vote. I would like to ask my colleague from New York who a few moments ago made a statement that we should give a steel mill to India because the Russians gave a steel mill to India. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRY. I am very glad you took the well to ask that question, because that was not my intention. I said that they, the Indians, are embarrassed that the Russians have given them a steel mill. They would like a steel mill from us. The Russian steel mill has been used as an effective propaganda weapon and the Soviets receive tremendous prestige from the steel produced from this mill. Since the Communist invasion of India's northern border, there has been a move in India away from Soviet influence toward the free world. The Bokaro steel mill has been depicted in India as the West's contribution to their steel requirements and has become a symbol of great consequence to Western prestige—whereas the feasibility reports have not justified a plant of the magnitude originally intended by some of its sponsors, the mill as finally constructed will be in keeping with the quantity and location of sufficient iron ore, coal, and limestone. I do not believe anyone in this House is now sufficiently qualified to finally determine the matter of the Bokaro plant, but I strongly oppose any amendment which singles out any one country's project for congressional approval. I do not however support the Broomfield amendment which postpones any final action during this fiscal year.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, that about sums up what we have been talking about for 3 days, in my humble opinion.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to say that we have a lot of steel mills in Pennsylvania that are not operating. We might pick up one of them and send it over there.

Mr. BECKER. I was trying to get to this point for my good friends in Pennsylvania. But I wanted to say something like this. It is not my understanding that Russia ever gave India anything. It is my understanding that Russia loaned the money for a steel mill on a hard loan and that India is paying 6 or 7 percent interest on about a 10- or 12-year loan. They gave them nothing. But the gentleman is saying, to make logic, that we should give them a steel mill because Russia has loaned them the money to build a steel mill. That makes about as much sense as the bill makes.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The substitute amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 16, line 3, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 3 insert the following:

"(k) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1964, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1)."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this is a version of an amendment offered to the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is the third in a series of private-enterprise amendments which I have previously mentioned. The two previous ones have been adopted. I would hope that this one might also be.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to section 620 would suspend aid to any underdeveloped country which failed by December 31, 1964, to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program covering the specific risks of expropriation and inconvertibility.

When this amendment was first offered to the committee it also included a third risk, that is of war. This is no longer in the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the investment guarantee program is one designed to help the countries which sign these investment guarantee agreements. Fifty-three countries have now signed those with respect to the two matters that I have discussed; that is, expropriation and inconvertibility. If this amendment is adopted, after December 31 of next year—not this year—any country, any less-developed country, which did not have such an investment guarantee program initiated—that means started in any way whatsoever—would not be eligible for aid. When these countries sign these investment guarantees they make it much more attractive for U.S. private money to come into them. Thus this would aid their own industry and their own economy generally. That is the reason I say that this a measure which would be for the benefit of these countries which would agree to such investment guarantee program.

I fear that those countries which have not yet signed investment guarantee agreements have not done so, because they have some reason to suspect that there will be expropriation or that inconvertibility will become a reality. If they sign these agreements, if they sign even the first preliminary document looking toward an agreement, then they would qualify for aid.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to the Committee that the preliminary documents of which I hold one in my hand here, are very simple and very brief. They are not at all complex. They simply show the willingness of the country to make it possible for our Government through the Investment Guaranty Agency to assure American businesses that go in there that they will be protected against these two risks.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman explain the reason why he took out the third risk, war?

Mr. ADAIR. Because there were a great many countries which have not signed agreements relating to that risk; because I thought it was unpredictable in its effect; and because I felt that the two risks which are now covered are adequate. Hence, we would not ask these countries to guarantee against war or insurrection but we would ask that they make possible guarantees against expropriation and inconvertibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to ask the gentleman from Indiana a few questions.

The gentleman knows the Clay Committee made a recommendation somewhat along this line?

Mr. ADAIR. I know that.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think General Clay's recommendation went as far as your amendment; is that correct?

Mr. ADAIR. I think perhaps my amendment goes a little beyond the Clay Committee's recommendation, although

they were not exactly specific. They said in effect, "we do not think aid should go to any country which did not make possible the investment guarantee program."

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I remember asking General Clay some questions, also the AID Director, and I want to quote from the hearings, as follows; I said this was discussed by Mr. Bell at the hearings:

Mr. Bell said he doubted that the Clay Committee meant the U.S. aid should be made conditional on the signing of an investment guarantee agreement.

Would you indicate what you meant by the statement in your report?

General CLAY. If we were in the negotiation stage with respect to obtaining such guarantee and had every reason to believe that the negotiations were proceeding normally, I don't think we should make it a condition. It might, in fact, defeat the negotiation. Where we have evidence, however, that such a negotiation is not going to succeed or has indeed been refused, then we think it is very doubtful if aid should be extended.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman I am aware of that statement and that is the reason the proposed amendment provides that if a country makes any beginning whatsoever they will qualify for aid. I think this meets the objections set forth by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the gentlemen's purpose as indicated by his amendment. He has used less developed and underdeveloped countries. I do not know why he limits it to this category of countries, and how he would suggest that the administrator could define less or underdeveloped countries.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that phrase should be "less developed." That has been defined by the Presidential document which appeared in the Federal Register on the 29th of December of last year. I shall not quote it, but the President used the phrase "less developed countries." That is the reason we used the phrase, because the definition is here.

Mr. McDOWELL. Does the gentleman still feel it should apply to this category of country?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, I do feel it should apply. In the first place, more developed countries have no use for it. Consequently, there might be a question in my mind as to its effect upon military aid given to more developed countries. I would not want to limit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAIR and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 150.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise in any country unless the President determines that similar productive enterprises within the United States are operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and that such assistance will not result in depriving such United States enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of assistance furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of productive enterprises in all countries, including specifically the numbers of such enterprises, the types of such enterprises, and the locations of such enterprises."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I have examined his amendment, and I think already in the act under sections 201, 211, and 604 the program is required to consider the effect of the program on the U.S. economy. In section 622 we already require projects to be subject to American enterprise and 620(d) has a provision with regard to any enterprise which would compete in U.S. markets. I think there is flexibility in the gentleman's amendment. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, let us set the record straight on just how much this foreign aid program has benefited the American industry and worker.

Here is what foreign aid has done to just one plant in my district near Houston, Tex. More than 400 workers at Sheffield Steel have lost their jobs; one division of the plant is operating at 20 percent capacity, another at 50 percent. This is a direct result of the flood of cheap-made foreign steel from plants built with the American workers' tax money.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, with friends passing on benefits like this—we do not need any enemies.

The American people are asking how it has happened, and why it has happened. And I will tell you how and why: The Agency for International Development gives absolutely no consideration to our own industry before granting millions to build plants to compete against us. It is time this Congress forced AID to consider the impact upon us before using taxpayers' money to export American jobs. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is a simple amendment and to

the point. It allows the Executive ample latitude. But, for the first time, it forces the foreign aid boys to consider the impact of this program on our own people.

If there be any doubt about the need for this amendment, let me state emphatically that not only does AID fail to consider the impact upon our own domestic industry—but I am convinced little, if any, thought is given to world market conditions before the handouts are passed around.

This Agency cannot tell you today how many steel plants, pulp and paper mills, chemical plants, rubber plants, aluminum plants, or petroleum facilities it has built around the world.

It took me nearly 4 months to obtain a very incomplete listing of specific foreign industries and plants financed by the American taxpayer, and I want to cite a brief paragraph from the Library of Congress expert who finally compiled it:

The enumeration of total foreign aid to specific industries can be undertaken with only limited success * * *. The Agency itself does not compile aid figures according to industry or by name.

Well, let me tell my colleagues from the 37 States having steelmaking facilities that the tax money of your workers has been used to build or expand somewhere in the neighborhood of 179 foreign steel plants. It cost just about \$2 billion.

If I seem to bear down more on the plight of the steel industry, it is because it stands alongside the American oil industry, and the American textile industry, backed against the wall by the flood of foreign imports. And I tell every Member of this House that these three industries will soon be joined by a host of others as this foreign competition we have built tries to capture our own domestic markets.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleagues will find most enlightening some brief statistics on the number of plants we have built under foreign aid: Since 1945, we have built, modernized or expanded 179 foreign steel plants. In the past 5 years, look at the aid given the following foreign industries: Pulp and paper—31 plants built or expanded. Chemical plants—24 plants built or expanded. Aluminum—13 plants built or expanded. Rubber—22 plants built or expanded. Petroleum—27 loans or grants for studies or to build plants.

Every Member of this body knows the plight of the American textile industry—of plants shut down and workers unemployed—overwhelmed by a flood of cheap-made foreign imports. I leave it to my colleagues most concerned to make a case for this particular crippled industry.

But let us examine two industries I am personally familiar with, and whose workers pump tax money in the AID horn of plenty:

The United States, in 1950, had 46 percent of the world's steel production. Now it has 25 percent. In 1950, we had 17 percent of the world's steel market—and for the past 3 years, it has been down, less than 6 percent. Today, our steel mills are operating at 55 percent of their capacity.

The dumping of foreign steel has crippled the wire and rod production in this country, and has captured some 30 percent of the domestic market. Both labor and management officials of this great industry just met with President Kennedy, begging for help to compete against foreign steel dumping in the United States.

What they should have pleaded for is a prohibition against building any more steel plants under the foreign aid program to compete against them in the world market, and here at home.

A friend at Sheffield's plant wrote that "what scares me is the influx of foreign plate which is our bread-and-butter product. For example, it is alarming to note the continuing rise of Mexican steel plates imported into the United States—from 65 tons in 1960 to 12,000 tons in 1962, and for the first 5 months of this year, the total was 21,000 tons."

Well, whose tax money do you think built the 22 Mexican steel mills under our aid program? This is a grim picture faced by one of our basic industries.

But let us look at the pulp and paper industry, and you will see what I mean about the foreign aid agency failing to consider world market conditions before building plants overseas.

The entire world produces 107 million tons of paper a year—and it consumes only 93 million tons. In Western Europe alone there is an excess capacity to produce pulp and paper that totals 3.5 million tons. Because of this, the Scandinavian paper industry has voluntarily curtailed production, and will continue to do so for another year or more. So what does AID do in the face of this? In 1961 we built or expanded paper plants in Finland, Israel, Greece, Egypt, and Communist Yugoslavia. Why?

One of my good friends is president of one of our leading paper companies. I wrote him briefly on action I intended to take, and told him of the pulp and paper mills built around the world with tax money of himself and his employees. Let me read a brief part of his letter of reply:

I am astonished at the number of pulp and paper mills constructed overseas with U.S. dollars under the foreign aid program—each one of them to compete with and to absorb our natural markets. I knew that some had been built in this manner, financed by our tax dollars, but I am both amazed and dismayed at the number. I think what you have in mind undertaking is exemplary and urgently required.

This distinguished American executive stated emphatically that not only his own company—but the pulp and paper industry overall—has suffered from foreign competition. He points out that countries such as Finland—where we built three paper mills in the past 5 years—are diverting more of their own products to the United States because markets that Finland used to supply are now supplied by other plants we have built.

This, briefly, is the picture facing only two of our great industries as a direct result of the foreign aid program.

I do not think it necessary to point out the importance of the pulp and paper

industry to my colleagues from timber-producing States—nor is the plight of our domestic steel industry lost on my friends from iron-ore- and coal-producing areas.

In summing up, let me again state that my amendment is not restrictive, it is not punitive. It merely holds this Agency's feet to the fire so that for the first time it will take into consideration the plight of our own plants and workers before it exports any more jobs abroad. I urge your support, and I submit for the enlightenment of my colleagues and their constituents the compilation on assistance furnished specific industries by the American taxpayer:

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945-63

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CREDITS TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1945-63

Africa:	Amount authorized
Liberia:	
Liberia Mining Co., 1949----	\$4,000,000
Liberia Iron Ore Ltd., 1960----	5,625,000
National Iron Ore Ltd., 1960-----	6,000,000
Liberian Amer-Swed Minerals, 1960-----	30,000,000
Asia:	
Japan:	
Fuji Iron & Steel Co., 1957--	10,300,000
Yawata Iron & Steel Co., 1957-----	26,000,000
Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd., 1958--	7,100,000
Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd., 1960--	3,000,000
Japan Steel & Tube Co., 1961-----	6,500,000
Fuji Iron and Steel Co., 1961-----	15,600,000
Sumimoto Metal, Inc., 1962--	8,100,000
Yawata Iron & Steel Co., 1962-----	26,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Corp., 1962--	18,500,000
Philippines:	
American Wire & Cable Co., 1957-----	98,000
Ysmael Steel Mfg. Co., 1957--	68,000
Jacinto Steel, Inc., 1958----	58,000
Central Bank of Philippines for steel mill construction, 1961-----	62,300,000
Turkey:	
Vulcan Iron Works, 1946----	5,341,014
Vulcan Iron Works, 1947----	2,521,469
Republic of Turkey, 1950----	681,563
Republic of Turkey, Karabuk Iron & Steel, 1959----	15,000,000
Canada:	
Steep Rock Mines, Ltd., 1948--	5,700,000
Europe:	
Austria: Oesterreichisch-Alpine, 1957-----	28,150,000
France:	
Union Sid du Nord, 1960----	1,036,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1960----	1,142,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1960----	3,536,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1961----	842,000
Germany: August Thyssen-Hutte, A.G., 1956-----	10,000,000
Italy:	
Instituto Mobiliare Italiano, 1947-----	9,000,000
Instituto Mobiliare Steel Mills:	
Alti Forni, 1947-----	3,634,000
Terni, 1947-----	1,350,000
Dalmine, 1947-----	1,300,000
Cornigliano, 1947-----	3,000,000
Equipment for steel mills, 1955-----	2,000,000
Equipment for steel mills, 1955-----	5,000,000
Equipment for auto and steel, 1956-----	10,000,000
Innocenti, S.P.A., 1956----	1,500,000
Equipment for steel mill, 1958-----	7,000,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945-63—Con.

Europe—Continued	Amount authorized
Italy—Continued	
Blast furnace and rolling mill, 1958.....	\$6,500,000
Italsider steel plant, 1962..	25,000,000
Spain:	
Union de Siderurgicas Asturianas, S.A., 1958.....	6,800,000
Empresa Nacional, 1959.....	4,400,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1960.....	2,300,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1961.....	13,000,000
Altos Hornos Viscaya, 1961..	18,000,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1962.....	6,600,000
Yugoslavia: Government of Yugoslavia to purchase original U.S. steel mill equipment, 1961.....	15,000,000
Latin America:	
Argentina:	
Soc Mixta Siderurgia, 1955..	60,000,000
Acinifer, SA, 1959.....	700,000
Socie Indus Argentina, Tubos Acero, 1959.....	1,710,000
Acindar Ind. Argentina Aceros, 1960.....	5,645,000
Dalmino, SAFTA, 1960.....	1,842,000
Soc. Ind. Argentina Tubos Ac., 1960.....	1,675,000
Industrias Puerto San Martin, 1958.....	90,000
Somisa, Steel Mill Equipment, 1960.....	12,000,000
Acinifer Ind. Arg. Acero SA, 1960.....	170,500
Acinifer Ind. Fundiciones SA, 1961.....	105,000
Ryca SAM Steel Shear, 1961.....	9,000
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1961.....	241,660
Dolmine SAFTA, Equipment, 1961.....	21,000
Acinifer Ind. Arg. Fundiciones, 1961.....	20,400
Tinical SRL Equipment, 1961.....	5,000
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962.....	91,700
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962.....	225,900
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962.....	100,600
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962.....	127,100
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962.....	26,200
Metalurgica Tandil, 1962....	114,500
Brazil:	
Cia Sid NAC, 1950.....	25,000,000
Cia Metalurgica Barbara, 1952.....	2,185,000
Cia Siderurgica Belgo, 1955..	730,440
Cia Sid NAC, 1956.....	35,000,000
Acos Villares AA, 1957.....	2,320,000
Soc Tecnica Fundicoes Gerais, 1957.....	2,558,000
Cia Vale Do Rio Doce SA, 1958.....	12,500,000
Chile:	
Corp. De Fomento Prod., 1951.....	58,000,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico SA, 1956.....	3,550,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1957.....	16,000,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1960.....	15,574,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1962.....	8,300,000
Mexico:	
Cia Fundidora de F.Y.A. Monterrey, S.A., 1945.....	800,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945-63—Con.

Latin America—Continued	Amount authorized
Mexico—Continued	
National Financiera S.A., 1951.....	\$5,000,000
Cia Fundidora de Fierro y Acero de Monterrey S.A., 1952.....	4,500,000
National Financiera S.A., 1952.....	3,600,000
La Consolidada S.A., 1955..	662,000
Hojalata y Lamina S.A., 1955.....	2,055,000
Aceros de Chihuahua S.A., 1955.....	720,000
Cia Fundidora de Monterrey, 1956.....	46,500,000
National Financiera S.A., 1957.....	16,000,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960.....	174,000
Aceros de Chihuahua S.A., 1960.....	550,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960.....	1,479,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960.....	443,850
Tubacero S.A., 1960.....	4,000,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961.....	120,000
Manufacturas Metalicas MSA, 1961.....	113,500
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961.....	290,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961.....	345,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961.....	51,886
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1962.....	1,850,000
Peru:	
Marcona Mining Co., 1953..	2,500,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1957..	10,000,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1961..	6,500,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1962..	6,000,000
Metalurgica Pervana, 1962..	1,950,000
Uruguay:	
Cinoca, S.A., 1961.....	65,500
Cinoca, S.A., 1961.....	35,000
INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT LOANS FOR FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1946-63	
Asia:	
India:	
Indian Iron & Steel, 1952..	\$31,500,000
Indian Iron & Steel, 1956..	20,000,000
Tata Iron & Steel Co., 1956..	75,000,000
Tata Iron & Steel, 1957.....	32,500,000
Indian Iron & Steel, 1961..	19,500,000
Japan:	
Japan Development Bank:	
Yawata Plate Mill, 1955..	5,300,000
Yawata Steel Production, 1959.....	20,000,000
Kawasaki Strip Mill, 1956.....	20,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Production, 1958.....	8,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Production, 1960.....	6,000,000
Sumitomo Steel Production, 1958.....	33,000,000
Sumitomo Steel Production, 1960.....	7,000,000
Kobe Steel Production, 1958.....	10,000,000
Nippon Kokan Steel Production, 1958.....	22,000,000
Fuji Steel Production, 1959.....	24,000,000
Europe:	
Belgium: Equipment for steel and power industries, 1949..	16,000,000
France: Miferm, 1960.....	66,000,000
Luxembourg: Steel mill and railroad, 1947.....	12,000,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945-63—Con.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1956-63	Amount authorized
Asia:	
India: Republic Forge Co., 1959.....	\$1,500,000
Pakistan: Steel Corp. of Pakistan, 1958.....	630,000
Latin America:	
Argentina: Acindar Industria Arg. de Aceros S.A., 1960..	3,660,000
Mexico:	
Compania Findidora de Fierro y Acero Monterrey, 1963.....	1,126,000
Tubos de Aceros de Mexico, 1963.....	400,000
Venezuela: Siderurgica Venesolana SA, 1960.....	500,000
EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1949-51	
Europe:	
Austria:	
Voest, Linz, 1949.....	\$2,887,000
Voest, Linz, 1949.....	8,362,000
Voest, Linz, 1950.....	2,169,000
Alpine Montan, 1949.....	4,147,000
Alpine Montan, 1949.....	3,346,000
Alpine Montan, 1950.....	4,208,000
Belgium:	
S.A. Metallurgique d'Esperance-Longdoz, Liege, 1949	2,329,000
S.A. Ongree Marhaye, Ougree, 1950.....	2,866,000
Phenix Works, Flammale-Haute, 1949.....	3,148,000
France:	
Sollac, Hayange and Ebange, 1949.....	56,164,000
Usinor, Denain and Montataire, 1949.....	11,919,000
Sideler, Bombas, 1949.....	1,301,000
Ste. Anonyme des Forges, Saar, 1950.....	2,038,000
Acieries de Longwy. Mont. St. Martin, 1950.....	2,094,000
J. J. Carnaud et Forges de Basse-Indre, 1949.....	1,959,000
Italy:	
Finisider, 1949.....	32,390,000
Fiat, Turin and Avigliana, 1949.....	7,408,000
Acciaierie e Ferriere, Milan, 1949.....	1,649,000
Acciaierie e Ferriere, Milan, 1950.....	4,502,000
Cantieri Metallurgici Italiani, 1949.....	2,131,000
Sisma, Villadossola, 1949..	2,538,000
Terni, Societa per L'Elettricit, Terni, 1949.....	1,315,000
Recaelli, Rogorodo, 1950..	1,067,000
Issa-Viola, Aosta Valley, 1949.....	1,569,000
Ferretubi, SPA, Milan, 1949..	200,000
Netherlands: Royal Dutch Blast Furnace and Steel Co., 1949.....	14,935,000
Portugal: A. J. Oliveira Filhos Co., 1949.....	847,000
Spain: Sagunto Steel Plant, 1952.....	853,000
United Kingdom:	
Steel Co. of Wales, Ltd., 1949.....	25,373,000
Stewarts & Lloyds, Ltd., 1949.....	1,851,000
AID OR PREDECESSOR AGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1954-62	
Europe:	
Spain:	
Altos Hornos de Viscaya, 1954.....	\$4,460,000
Empresa Blast Furnace, 1954.....	3,100,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945-63—Con.

<i>Europe—Continued</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Yugoslavia: Sisak Iron Works, 1961.....	\$8,500,000
European Coal & Steel Community: Contribution to capitalization loan, 1954.....	100,000,000
<i>Far East:</i>	
Republic of China:	
Ya Tung Tube Mill, 1955.....	466,000
Tang Eng Ironworks, 1957.....	229,000
Korea:	
Wire Rope Mfg. Co., 1956.....	122,000
Chain Mfg. Co., 1956.....	111,000
Pusan Iron Works, 1955.....	1,955,000
<i>Near East and South Asia:</i>	
India: Bokaro Steel Plant, 1962.....	750,000
Turkey: Ereğli Steel Mill, 1959.....	129,600,000

FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES ASSISTED FROM U.S.-OWNED FOREIGN CURRENCIES 1954-62

<i>Europe:</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Austria:	
Steel mill, 1957, Public Law 480.....	\$1,346,000
Steel mill and tool manufacturing, 1958, Public Law 480.....	846,000
Steel and malleable foundry, 1958, Public Law 480.....	577,000
Fabricated structural steel, 1957, Public Law 480.....	385,000
Yugoslavia: Niksic Iron Works, 1958, Public Law 480.....	5,610,000
Latin America: Brazil, Minas Gerais Steel Plant, 1961, Public Law 480.....	6,831,000
Asia: India, Bokaro Steel Plant, 1962, Public Law 402.....	91,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958-62

<i>PULP AND PAPER PLANTS</i>	<i>Amount of aid grants and loans</i>
1958:	
Taiwan: Papermill expansion.....	\$162,000
Iceland: Wastepaper pulp equipment.....	2,000
Yugoslavia: Pulp and paper manufacturing equipment.....	21,000
Israel: Paper plant.....	3,000,000
Finland: Wood pulp equipment.....	750,000
Argentina: Pulp and paper mill.....	7,600,000
Colombia: Papermill.....	5,700,000
Mexico: Pulp and papermill equipment.....	333,000
1959:	
Vietnam: Pulp plant.....	265,000
Yugoslavia: Processing pulp.....	47,000
Argentina: Pulp mill expansion.....	2,220,000
Philippines: Pulp and papermill machinery.....	5,400,000
Colombia: Pulpmill machinery.....	180,000
1960:	
Finland: Pulp and paperboard machinery.....	2,056,000
Argentina: Pulp and papermill.....	9,190,000
Venezuela: Papermill machinery.....	198,000
Tanganyika: Pulp and papermill.....	6,250,000
Egypt: Pulpmill.....	6,700,000
Yugoslavia:	
Pulp and paper products machinery.....	54,000
Pulp and paper mill.....	3,093,000
South Africa: Pulp machinery.....	61,000
India: Pulp and paper mill.....	18,500,000
Finland: newsprint machinery.....	5,203,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958-62—Continued

	<i>Amount of aid grants and loans</i>
1960:	
Israel: Pulp and paper machinery-----	\$670,000
Greece: Pulp machinery for fiberboard-----	2,500,000
Argentina: Pulp and paper machinery-----	80,000
Colombia: Cellophane paper machinery-----	196,000
Panama: Paper bag machinery-----	17,000
1962:	
Philippines: Pulp and paper mill machinery-----	100,000
Egypt: Cellophane plant-----	3,000,000
Venezuela: Bagasse plant-----	1,450,000

PETROLEUM AND RELATED FACILITIES

	<i>Amount of aid grants and loans</i>
1958:	
India:	
Oil and Gas Commission-----	\$41,000
Fuel Research Institute-----	25,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques-----	6,000
Taiwan:	
Petroleum refining-----	145,000
Petroleum products diversification-----	97,000
Bolivia: Ministry of Petroleum-----	83,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plants-----	289,000
1959:	
India: Oil and Commission-----	12,000
Israel:	
Oil field conservation techniques-----	6,000
Petroleum facilities-----	367,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plants-----	83,600
Spain: Petroleum production study-----	8,000
Panama: Petroleum regulations study-----	16,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities-----	500,000
1960:	
India: Oil and Gas Commission-----	42,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques-----	38,000
Panama: Petroleum laws study-----	1,000
Italy: Petroleum and chemical plant-----	2,890,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plant-----	10,000
Pakistan: Petroleum gas treating plant-----	1,994,000
1961:	
India: Oil and Gas Commission-----	31,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques-----	6,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities-----	836,000
Finland: Petroleum facilities-----	1,750,000
Chile: Petroleum plants-----	34,500
1962:	
Colombia: Petroleum asphalt equipment-----	31,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities-----	570,000
CHEMICAL PLANTS	
1958:	
Taiwan:	
Caustic soda-----	144,000
Urea plant-----	1,617,000
Japan: Chemical plant expansion-----	2,300,000
Mexico: Chemical production-----	460,000
1959:	
Taiwan: Urea plant expansion-----	189,000
India: Phosphorous plant-----	21,000
Korea: Soda ash plant-----	5,600,000
Columbia: Chemical plant facilities-----	460,000
Peru: Chemical plant-----	700,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958-62—Continued

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1960:	
Taiwan:	
Urea plant.....	\$1,884,000
Sulfuric acid plant.....	74,000
Indonesia: Nitrogenous chem- ical plant.....	33,200,000
Argentina: Phenol plant.....	2,000,000
Mexico: Citric acid plant.....	800,000
Israel: Chemical facilities....	258,000
1961:	
Israel: Chemical plant.....	7,150,000
Mexico: Chemical plant equip- ment.....	58,000
Peru: Chemical plant equip- ment.....	508,300
Turkey: Chemical plant.....	2,800,000
1962:	
India: Chemical plant facili- ties.....	7,650,000
Japan: Ammonia and urea plant.....	800,000
Argentina: Chemical plant for synthetics.....	413,000
Chile: Sulfuric acid plant.....	95,000
Colombia: Chemical fertilizer plant.....	237,200
ALUMINUM PLANTS	
1958: Taiwan: Aluminum plant modernization.....	672,000
Austria:	
Aluminum products plant..	385,000
Aluminum plant.....	1,000,000
1959:	
Taiwan: Aluminum plant.....	1,350,000
Colombia: Aluminum plant facilities.....	400,000
1960:	
India:	
Aluminum reduction plant..	13,650,000
Aluminum fabricating plant..	5,000,000
Aluminum plant.....	2,000,000
Lebanon:	
Aluminum plant.....	400,000
Aluminum extrusion facili- ties.....	124,300
1961:	
Taiwan: Aluminum plant modernization.....	238,000
Philippines: Aluminum press.....	150,500
Mexico: Aluminum smelter....	6,500,000
PLASTIC PLANTS	
1958: Cuba: Plastic injection molders.....	14,000
1959:	
Argentina: Polyethylene plant..	8,000,000
France: Plastic plant facilities..	370,000
1960:	
Argentina: Plastic extrusion facilities.....	110,000
Yugoslavia: Plastics plant.....	23,000,000
1961:	
Argentina:	
Plastics plant equipment.....	9,000
Plastics products equipment..	24,500
Korea: Plastics plant for fi- bers.....	3,200,000
Israel: Plastics equipment.....	80,000
RUBBER PLANTS	
1958: Colombia: Rubber develop- ment.....	2,000
Peru: Rubber development.....	200,000
Latin America: Regional rub- ber development.....	600,000
Austria: Rubber plant equip- ment.....	769,000
1959:	
Guatemala: Rubber develop- ment.....	50,000
Latin America: Regional rub- ber development.....	400,000
Spain: Rubber plant.....	650,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958-62—Continued		Amount of aid grants and loans
1959:		
Argentina: Rubber pneumatic plant.....	\$3,300,000	
Guatemala: Rubber plant.....	5,000,000	
Israel: Rubber plant facilities..	457,000	
1960:		
Guatemala: Rubber develop- ment.....	156,000	
Peru: Rubber development.....	199,000	
India: Rubber plant.....	4,500,000	
1961:		
Guatemala: Rubber develop- ment.....	180,000	

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958-62—Continued		Amount of aid grants and loans
1961:		
Peru: Rubber development.....	\$20,000	
Turkey: Rubber plant.....	4,000,000	
India: Rubber plant.....	8,000,000	
1962:		
Guatemala: Rubber develop- ment.....	26,000	
Brazil: Synthetic rubber plant..	3,400,000	
Turkey: Rubber plant.....	3,125,000	
India:		
Rubber equipment.....	500,000	
Synthetic rubber plant.....	3,000,000	

Hourly employment costs—American versus foreign steel industries

Country	Hourly employ- ment costs ¹		Increase 1961 over 1962		Foreign as percent of United States	
	1962	1961	Cents	Percent	1962	1961
Luxembourg.....	\$0.98	\$1.47	\$0.49	50	42	37
Belgium.....	.82	1.26	.44	54	35	32
France.....	.72	1.11	.39	54	31	28
West Germany.....	.69	1.37	.68	99	30	34
Italy.....	.64	1.04	.40	63	27	26
Netherlands.....	.53	1.40	.87	164	23	35
European Coal and Steel Community aver- age.....	.72	1.25	.53	74	31	31
Japan.....	.32	.63	.31	97	14	16
United States.....	2.32	3.99	1.67	72	100	100

¹ Sources: 1952-60 data, Information Statistique; 1961 data, Siderurgie; 1962, No. 5 and 6, European Coal and Steel Community; Japan Iron and Steel Federation; and American Iron and Steel Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. KELLY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8, insert the following:

"(k) No assistance shall be furnished under section 201, 211, or 251 of this Act to the government of any country which does not agree to permit such reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States as the President may require for the purpose of ascertaining whether such assistance is being administered within the recipient country to carry out the purposes for which it was furnished."

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, relating to inspections. The amendment is very simple.

It states that no assistance shall be furnished under sections 201, 211, or 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act to any country which does not permit our Government to review and inspect the utilization of our aid. The amendment further directs the President to establish such procedures as he deems necessary to implement this proposal.

This is not an unusual requirement. We already have, in section 506(a) (3) of the act a provision which relates to the inspection of military assistance furnished on a grant basis.

My amendment would apply a similar requirement to economic development grants and loans and to the Alliance for Progress.

Many of the loan and aid agreements entered into by the Agency for International Development with foreign countries already provide for U.S. inspection and review of aid projects. This, however, is not an overall policy followed by our Government in every instance.

What I want to do is to bring some uniformity to the administration of foreign aid and to strengthen the program by making it apply across the board.

I would like to stress two things about my amendment. First, the amendment applies only to development loans, development grants, and the Alliance for Progress. It does not apply to supporting assistance, the contingency fund, and certain technical assistance projects.

And second, the amendment gives the President ample discretionary authority. It leaves it up to the President to determine what procedures are necessary to assure proper inspection—and proper utilization—of our aid. The amendment does not bind the President to any particular set of standards or requirements. It does, however, serve notice on the President, and all foreign countries receiving our aid, that the Congress expects our assistance to be checked carefully, and to be used only for the purpose for which it is given.

Mr. Chairman, the need for the adoption of this amendment was underlined in a report which I received recently from the Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General said, in part—and I would like to quote:

Although we have been able to resolve satisfactorily the difficulties we have encountered in auditing foreign aid programs, it is to be noted that recipient countries are not required, as a condition to receiving economic and technical assistance grants and loans, to permit observation and review by,

or furnish information to, U.S. representatives. Enactment of such a requirement would make it clear that recipient countries are expected to grant the right of observation and review to U.S. representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Comptroller General's recommendations speak for themselves. I think this is a reasonable amendment and that it will strengthen the administration of the foreign assistance program. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. This amendment, of course, was discussed in committee. It lost in committee by a tie vote. I supported the amendment of the gentleman in committee. I have consulted members of the committee who opposed it before, and I see no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree and heartily support the provisions contained in subsection (i) of this section and commend the committee for including it in its bill. I particularly want to compliment the able gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], a member of the committee, for his tireless and effective work in developing this provision. And I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for his outstanding activity in the area this subsection covers.

The subsection, in substance, is a forthright, clear, declaration that we do not want any nation receiving our aid for economic development to divert its own resources for a military buildup for aggressive action against us or any other recipient of our aid and that any violator of this subsection disqualifies itself from receiving our assistance. It is more than a guideline—more than a sense of Congress. It is a mandate that we must insist be fulfilled.

There is no question in my mind—and I doubt there is any in the committee's—that this provision is immediately applicable to the United Arab Republic, one of the most vicious violators of the principles and ideals of our economic assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to ask the Chairman of the committee an extremely pertinent question. Is it the intention of the committee that this subsection apply directly to the United Arab Republic?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I think the amendment covers the United Arab Republic.

Mr. HALPERN. Is it just a question of thinking that it does, or does it actually apply?

Mr. MORGAN. It covers the United Arab Republic.

Mr. HALPERN. It is important that this be set forth clearly in the Record

and I am pleased that the legislative history is definitely established on the subsection's objective lest there is any question whether it strikes directly at the United Arab Republic.

Nasser has flaunted our aid. He has made a mockery of the program, thereby weakening its highly purposeful and effective objectives elsewhere.

I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to have the language in this act specifically single out the United Arab Republic to be denied any aid whatsoever. I can also see the desirable purpose, however, in spelling out in the act an ever-present vital standard for all nations for determining qualification for our aid.

That is just what this amendment does. Its language does not equivocate. Heretofore, the closest to it that we could get, is the acceptance of the principle by amendment to the act's guidelines or sense of Congress expressions.

Last year the Congress did set forth its sense in the form of clear guidelines—Keating-Halpern amendment—which, in substance, is commendably retained in section 102 of this bill. They are now complemented and strengthened by this new subsection.

In themselves, Mr. Chairman, the guidelines in the bill—although the intent is the same—obviously are not sufficient. Last year, as I mentioned, we had strong sense of Congress language. This should have been enough to cut off aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic. The language certainly applied to that country. But, what happened?

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman. We gave even more aid to Nasser and his United Arab Republic—even in the face of worse abuses by his regime than heretofore—and of his even more extreme threats to the peace—financed indirectly by the American taxpayer. How ridiculous can a situation get?

Hence, it is obvious, a sense of Congress expression, in itself, is not strong enough. We need forthright language; so there can be no question of interpretation—and I believe this provision adequately does just that. But, when enacted we must see to it, each and every one of us who are concerned with international law, morality and justice, that it is fully implemented and that aid to the United Arab Republic is cut off forthwith.

I call on the President, immediately on the enactment of this legislation, to make a clear-cut determination and to fulfill the objective of the provision.

As stated in the Committee's report and stipulated in the legislative intent just expressed on the floor of this House, it clearly applies to Nasser—and there should be no delay in applying it.

For, what nation is more in violation of this subsection than the United Arab Republic?

What nation has more avowedly declared its objective of totally annihilating a neighboring state by force?

What nation receiving our aid is spending more for arms, for missiles, for an offensive war machine than Nasser's United Arab Republic?

Nasser has ruthlessly violated international law. He has defied resolutions of the United Nations, ignored treaty ob-

ligations, and agreements with other countries including the United States. He has perpetrated intrigues and revolutions in neighboring states, threatened the total annihilation of Israel. He has proliferated the rocket race with development of offensive missiles, waged discriminatory blockades and boycotts—affecting even American citizens and American businesses; exploited American assistance by diverting his own funds, for the purchase of mammoth Soviet arms. He has expropriated the properties of Americans and others; he has extolled Castro's Cuba and Communist China.

Let me show you how Nasser—this master of subversion, intrigue, hate, and tyranny—has made a farce of our aid program; how he has exploited it; how he has perverted its purpose.

Since 1946—and including the projected program—Nasser will have received over a billion dollars of American economic assistance. Last year, alone, we gave him over \$200 million. He spent that much and more in the same year in purchasing arms from the Sino-Soviet bloc. Imagine that. We put the dollars into his right pocket and he takes other money out of his left pocket to pay the Russians.

While we subsidize the United Arab Republic's domestic economy, Nasser has spent a sum reliably estimated at a figure at least \$1.4 billion in the period from 1961 to 1963 for Soviet arms and other military expenditures. Just think, a billion and a half dollars for military spending from an economically underdeveloped nation.

The United Arab Republic, depending on the American taxpayer for food, has spent more of its gross national product for military requirements than the United States.

I will give you a reliable breakdown of his military expenditures in the period of 1961 to 1963 and let you determine if a so-called neutralist state, threatened by no one, needs to divert such sums from its peaceful development and human needs. We have helped pick up the tab for the following. A new Soviet arms deal, just reported, approximately \$400 million: domestic missile production, \$250 million; upkeep for military establishment, \$600 million; military intervention in Yemen, \$100 million; subversion and assassination expenses in neighboring states, \$50 million. And, let me ask for what purpose an undeveloped nation needs 15 submarines, multistage rockets, and the latest Soviet jet bombers?

All this certainly leaves no question of his aggressive military buildup. Nasser's warmongering and subversion in the Middle East is the most obvious thing in the world. He even boasts about his designs in Israel.

As recently as this very month, less than 2 weeks ago, in a speech to his troops on August 12, he openly vowed the total destruction of Israel.

Direct reports from Iran, which I put in the RECORD only this Tuesday, tell how Nasser is financing agitation in that country to foment revolution against the Shah.

Nasser continues to ignore the Security Council resolution of June 11, 1963, to withdraw forces in Yemen. He has similarly defied the prior agreement of April 8, 1963, with the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. He also broke his word with the United States through misrepresentations that he would withdraw forces in exchange for our recognition of his Yemen puppet government.

This is only part of the story, Mr. Chairman. But, it is obviously sufficient to point to Nasser's unquestioned disqualification for aid under this section.

There are many other reasons that should, in themselves, suffice to cut off aid to Nasser beyond his unquestionable flagrant military aggression that this provision covers. As if this were not enough, there are other guidelines in this bill that fully cover them.

The August 1 issue of the New York Times tells of Nasser's nationalization of 500 companies including some American-owned firms.

He boastfully defies the United Nations resolution on freedom of passage for all shipping through the Suez Canal. He denies transit not only to Israeli ships but even bars and harasses American ships trading with Israel.

Cairo radio, subsidized in part by American funds spews anti-American hate and espouses the cause of Castro's Cuba and Communist China.

We partially finance the newsprint used by Egypt's government-controlled press. Yet, the very paper our dollars pay for, prints vicious attacks on the United States, calling us imperialists and exploiters.

In recent United Nations General Assembly sessions Nasser voted with the Soviet Union 37 times on key votes. But, listen to this—he voted only 4 times with the United States—4 out of 41.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is no question of interpretation here. The language is clear. Nasser's activities are clear. We can no longer remain as passive and inscrutable as the Sphinx, while Nasser sells us down the Nile. We should cut Nasser off forthwith until he can abide with international morality and the requirements of peace.

I fervently plead that this provision will be fully and immediately implemented.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. I want to say I am in full accord with his views. I think it is appropriate for me to say that this amendment to the bill was hammered out in the committee on a nonpartisan basis and that aid was given by the Republican members of the committee as well as the Democrats. So I think if there is any benefit to be obtained we all may share in it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one further word and that is that Egypt is a destructive force in the Near East, that she is trying to subvert the governments of many of the countries in the area, some of whom are our friends and some of whom are neutralist. As a result of her

destructive efforts it has become necessary for her to divert so much of her cotton from the purchase of foodstuffs to the purchase of arms from Russia that we are now constrained to feed one-third of her population. In addition to her threats against Israel, Egypt has permitted Soviet technicians numbering thousands to remain in Yemen despite her agreeing not to do so. I urge the President to pay heed to the language of the bill referring to the foregoing. I am pleased at this time to join with the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAYS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret we reach this part of the bill so late in the evening. Nothing however can detract from the importance of that section of the committee report on page 5 entitled "Situation in the Near East." It makes excellent, clear policy which most of us can and do agree with. If the executive will follow this policy war in the Near East probably would be prevented. It would implement paragraph (I) of section 306 of this bill. I hope many of my colleagues will take the trouble to contact the Executive and express support of the committee views and the intent of the House. The wisdom of the committee, if put into practice, could activate the cause of peace for the whole world, not just the Near East or any one country. I shall personally hope to be of some help in this vital purpose.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STINSON

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STINSON: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which receives weapons from any Communist country. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'Communist country' shall include, but shall not be limited to, the countries specified in subsection (f) of this section. The restriction contained in this subsection may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act."

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, the United States is currently giving foreign aid to nations which are spending part of their own meager resources for the purchases of military equipment from the Communist bloc. Such a practice has adverse effect on the national security of the United States in the following ways: In the first place, because of the balance-of-payments problems which face this country, and because of the gold outflow and monetary stability problems, items in the foreign assistance program must really be vital in order to be justified. A nation which can spend its resources on the purchases of unnecessary military equipment from Communist countries is not, in my opinion, in need of American dollars—especially when those dollars free financial re-

sources which are then transmitted to the Soviet Union.

My second point is that this practice seems to be indirectly supporting the balance of payments of the Soviet Union. Russia has a similar problem to ours, namely, earning enough foreign exchange to support its economic and military activities in the field against its enemy. That we, their enemy, should aid the Soviets in the solution of this problem, whether directly or indirectly, is more ironical than I, for one, can tolerate.

There are even greater potential problems which continuance of this practice may bring. One of the nations which is currently purchasing armaments from Communist bloc countries is the United Arab Republic. It is estimated that from 1961 through 1964 the United Arab Republic has contracted over \$300 million worth of armaments from the Soviet Union. If economic conditions in Egypt are bad enough to justify American aid, why has this tremendous amount been spent on arms which are unneeded for defense? The reason which justifies Nasser, of course, should not be the same reason which justifies American aid to him and his design for a new socialistic force in the Mideast.

Let us be frank. If the United Arab Republic and Israel go to war, only the Soviet Union will profit from the resulting misery and chaos. Therefore, it would be necessary for the United States to intervene to prevent the Soviets from realizing this advantage. In this case, how can the Congress justify, and approve of assistance to the United Arab Republic when that country is making such heavy arms purchases from the Soviet Union? In my opinion, it cannot—but the Congress can, if it prohibits aid to such a nation which purchases arms from the Communist bloc, perhaps force that nation to curtail its arms purchases.

The most glaring example of this practice is the case of Indonesia. This nation, in which the United States has spent almost \$700 million to bolster its economy, has indebted itself to the Soviet Union through military purchases to the extent of well over a billion dollars. No observer pretends that these expenditures are for defense, that they are necessary to maintain Indonesia's independence against a Soviet or Red Chinese threat.

Clearly they are to support Sukarno's imperialistic adventures in southeastern Asia. If Indonesia can spend over a billion dollars to buy unnecessary military equipment, what possible justification can there be for continued U.S. economic assistance? Fortunately, the committee has seen fit to effect some curtailment against Indonesia in this year's bill.

Other situations similar to these in the Near East and Indonesia can rapidly develop if we continue on our present course.

Other nations that are purchasing armaments from Communist countries which are receiving some form of American foreign aid include; Afghanistan, Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iraq,

Mali, and Morocco. If the Congress would adopt this amendment, I believe that very soon most of these nations would stop their arms purchases from the Communist countries. Naturally they are not interested in having their supply of American dollars cut off.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot believe that the American taxpayers want their hard earned tax dollars to eventually end up in Communist treasuries in payment for Communist weapons.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This is not a simple amendment, and in the interest of time I would like to state one of the things it would do. It would immediately cut off all assistance to India, it would throw them completely at the mercy of an invasion from China. It would also immediately cut off all assistance to Laos. It would throw all of these countries and many others, a long list of them, immediately into the arms of the Communists. I am sure the gentleman is against communism, and this is aiding and abetting that area.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. What this amendment would do is very simple; it would stop these countries that I listed from buying arms from Communist countries.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, that is not true. India has built up certain credits with the Soviet Union. That is the only way they can make use of these credits. The Soviet Union has been supplying materials to the Indians to prevent a threat from the Chinese. The gentleman would not like to encourage that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If we had a regime that was switching over to our side by means of some long-term contract agreements where there would be purchases under long-term contracts, it would also cut off countries that are coming our way?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; that is the long-range effect of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems to me the gentleman points out the nature of the problem we would be taking if we would deprive ourselves of the possibility of giving aid to a country which is one of the biggest in the world. She is receiving aid up to this time, and we would be very shortsighted, so far as our own security is concerned, not to try to keep her from going into the Communist bloc. As one of the alternatives she could come back into our good graces by stopping purchases from the Soviets. The other alternative would be she would be thrown into their arms. I think it would be a great mistake to make it obligatory for us to stop providing them with assistance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make a short observation on this particular amendment. I realize the gentleman from Washington did not intend it, but if this amendment is adopted, in my opinion it will be decidedly against the national interests of the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 307. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) (2) strike out "two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries" and substitute "one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary".

(2) In subsection (a) (3) strike out "nine" and substitute "ten".

(3) In subsection (b) strike out "paragraphs (2) and" and substitute "paragraph".

(b) Amend section 626(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

(2) In the second sentence strike out "Nor shall such service" and substitute "Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not".

(c) In section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor Committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such persons may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section."

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (k):

"(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred."

(e) Amend section 363, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by adding at

the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In carrying out programs under this Act, the President shall take all appropriate steps to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, (1) countries receiving assistance under this Act contribute local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services rendered in conjunction with such programs, and (2) foreign currencies owned by the United States are utilized to meet the costs of such contractual and other services."

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1963" and "\$53,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "\$54,000,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 308. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting "including orientation" after "training" the first time it appears.

SEC. 309. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpended balances, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 645. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86-735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, there are only two pending amendments to the rest of the bill. There may be more on the Speaker's desk. I wonder if we can get unanimous consent that the rest of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how long will it take to read the rest of the bill? We have been here this long, we might as well read the rest of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana object?

Mr. HALLECK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: Page 19, after line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 310. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 648. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, none of the funds available to carry out the provisions of this Act, shall be expended until the following question be submitted to qualified electors in a National Referendum.

"Shall the United States continue the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any amendments thereto, subsequent to June 30, 1964?"

"A majority of eligible voters voting affirmatively shall be necessary before the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and any amendments thereto, shall be operative. The cost of said referendum shall be paid by proceeds from the sale of surplus property under control of the Agency for International Development."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the foreign aid bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that all points of order have been waived on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all points of order are waived as to the text of the bill, as reported by the committee. Points of order are not waived as to amendments that might be offered to the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, in response to the point of order or in justification of the amendment, I think it is probably germane for I understand the people who would vote on this referendum are those who would pay the bill, that is, simply the taxpayers. I make no recommendation as to who might conduct the referendum although there are some experts, I know. I do think it is very serious when we hear talk day after day, and day after day about how everybody wants foreign aid, but nobody in my district writes to tell me so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the subject of the point of order.

Mr. DOLE. I will leave it to the discretion of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] offers an amendment to the bill which the Chair has had an opportunity to read and analyze. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill before the Committee. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago a female schoolteacher in my congressional district was dismissed by her school district for engaging in subversive activity. After an appeal to the courts the dismissal by the local school board still stood. Today this lady is in Bolivia acting as an adviser to the Bolivian Government in their educational system.

I know of no evidence which indicates that her husband is disloyal, but because he is always found where trouble is found and because of his wife and because he is my constituent, I do keep track of him. So when I heard a rumor that he was employed by the Agency for International Development, I made inquiry and received a reply which indicated that this gentleman was employed by the National Farmers Union, a contractor of AID during the latter part of 1962. He served as a member

of a team which visited two or three countries in Latin America. This information was given me by Mr. Eugene Wolfe, Acting Deputy Director for Operations of AID.

In the words of my constituent here were his duties. I quote him:

* * * working generally in the field of social and economic research connected with the Alliance for Progress.

I again quote him at a later point in his testimony.

It would call for work in the field, particularly in the Andes Mountains where a considerable amount of organizing and agitation is going on against the Alliance for Progress. My task would be to work with campesino groups and orient them toward our policy.

I am not attempting this afternoon to question the type of work he was doing, but I do think the House should know that the Agency for International Development is executing contracts with organizations like the National Farmers Union and that they are sending employees to South American countries for the purpose of orienting these countries toward our policies.

I might also say that I have learned upon further investigation that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, under the leadership of Mr. Clyde Ellis, received a contract and so has the Cooperative League of the United States of America. I say nothing against these groups, nor do I impugn them in any manner whatsoever, but I do point out that these organizations are registered with this House and with the Senate as lobbyists. I point out they are not offerors of hardware for sale, but they are advocates of social change. Yet we in this country have consistently advocated to the world and we proudly state that we are not seeking to impose our system or our ideas on the recipients of our foreign aid. It strikes me that for AID to award contracts to lobbying groups, which are in business for the purpose of advocating social change, we are contradicting our very foreign policy. In my opinion, this constitutes an unconscionable conflict of interest and one which I sincerely hope the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will go into in great depth during the next year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADER

MR. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 19, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 310. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 648. Commission on Foreign Economic Development.—(a) The Congress declares that a primary purpose of programs of foreign assistance is to raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free countries to develop their resources and improve their

productivity. It is the purpose of this section to discover ways to stimulate the creative energies of free peoples, including the fullest use of free private enterprise, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

"(b) There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Development (in this section referred to as the "Commission").

"(c) In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in subsection (a), the Commission, after a complete study and investigation, shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies, and administrative and other reforms, calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States, and the conduct of trade and commerce in such countries, and between such countries and other free countries, including the United States. The study and investigation by the Commission shall include a study of the operation of the programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, with a view to determining the impact of such programs upon investment of private capital in other free countries. The Commission shall give particular attention to developing programs and policies calculated to eliminate or minimize the restrictions, hazards, and other impediments, foreign and domestic (including monopolistic and restrictive trade practices) which inhibit such investment, trade, and commerce, and to provide incentives for such investments, trade, and commerce.

"(d) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members, as follows:

"(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States;

"(2) Two Members of the Senate of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Vice President; and

"(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

"(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(h) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(i) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(j) The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(k) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(l) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 203, 205, or 207 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(m) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(n) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(o) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(p) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this section; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(q) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(r) The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1966."

MR. MEADER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MR. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment incorporates in the foreign aid authorization bill the provisions of H.R. 6679 which I introduced last June to create a Commission on Foreign Economic Development.

This bipartisan, 12-man Commission, would have the duty to study the foreign aid program and would "recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies and administrative and other reforms calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States."

I testified in support of this proposal before the Foreign Affairs Committee, June 3, 1963. My testimony appears on pages 1421-1437 of the hearings.

My recommendation to establish a study commission on foreign aid is not a new one. I first made this recommendation April 23, 1951, and explained its purpose at some length in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 6, pages 4209-4214.

I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee during hearings on the mutual security program in the 82d Congress, 1st session, and my testimony and that of a representative of the Detroit Board of Commerce supporting my proposal appears on pages 777-835 of the hearings.

I have offered my proposal as an amendment to mutual security legislation on several occasions, the last being during the consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1961 on Thursday, August 17, 1961. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in opposing my amendment, among other things said the following:

It is possible that the amendment has some merit, but I do not think the mutual security bill of 1961 is the place for this amendment.

This amendment sets up a special commission of 14 members, as the gentleman has outlined in his presentation, some on the executive payroll and some consultants at \$50 per diem. I think maybe it would be best for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to study this and, if necessary, give the gentleman from Michigan a hearing on the bill. I am sure this matter is important enough to go through the regular procedure and be referred to the committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 12, p. 16207.)

There is a significant difference between H.R. 6679 and predecessor bills I have introduced. Predecessor bills limited the commission study to identifying impediments to investment of private capital overseas for economic development and making recommendations for their elimination or diminution. H.R. 6697 broadens the study of the commission to include the entire foreign aid program.

The first reaction of members of the committee might be that another study is unnecessary in view of the recent study by the Clay Committee.

I think the answer to that question is that the Clay Committee study was excellent as far as it went, but that its 22-page report based upon a 3 months' study by distinguished citizens consisted mainly in general conclusions and opinions and fell far short of being a penetrating study of foreign aid with specific recommendations.

The commission I propose to establish might well take the Clay Committee's report as a starting point and then, with an able staff and in the 3-year period provided for the commission's existence, make a detailed examination of the foreign aid program and make specific recommendations for its reformation aimed particularly at enlisting private capital for economic development overseas with the purpose of gradually diminishing the need for American Government funds. The relatively small cost of the operation of such a commission, if it were successful, would result in vast savings not only in reduction of the burden on the American taxpayer but in improved effectiveness of the program.

To the extent we can transfer the task of economic development to private capital rather than Government grants, we not only relieve the tax burden, but at the same time, through the creation of wealth through economic development, broaden the tax base.

Only a few years ago, administration officials and certain segments of the press were strenuously advocating establishment of the foreign aid program on a long-term basis and with more flexibility, including back-door spending.

The Clay report of March 20, 1963, obviously moves in the opposite direction and contemplates a reduction and tapering off of U.S. foreign aid and a tightening up of its administration.

I find the philosophy of the Clay report largely harmonious with my own attitude toward foreign aid and wish to draw attention particularly to paragraph 5 on page 12 of the Clay report, a recommendation relating to Latin America and the Alliance for Progress, but in my opinion contains principles which are equally applicable elsewhere. I quote:

We must continue to assume leadership with Latin Americans in stimulating the offering of incentives to the private sector which are required if Latin development goals are to be attained. Impediments to the growth of private enterprise must be identified and treated, the shallowness and harm of doctrinaire biases against responsible private enterprise exposed, new sources of credit opened to medium and small Latin American businessmen, and foreign investment encouraged in the confidence that all governments now have means to protect themselves against potential abuses. Agitation for the expropriation of foreign enterprises and for nationalization of private productive ventures is hardly conducive to the mobilization of private local and foreign capital investment and is destructive to rapid economic progress. Latin America must be encouraged to see its essential choice between totalitarian, inefficient, state-controlled economies and societies on the one hand and an economically and politically freer system on the other, realizing that a society must begin to accumulate wealth before it can provide an improved standard of living for its members. We believe the increasing acknowledgment that proper incentives to the private sector are required for dynamic growth must be accompanied by sustained U.S. and Latin American efforts and decisions at all levels of government policy and action. With such a basis, a more progressive Latin private enterprise spirit, substantial foreign investment which receives no more and no less than fair treatment, and other Alliance aid,

the development of Latin America would be assured.

It is obvious from the Clay report's conclusions "impediments to the growth of private enterprise must be identified and treated" that the committee did not pretend that it itself had done that job. It is my suggestion that the best way to identify impediments to private capital investment is to establish a commission such as I recommend.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware that the aid program has been studied and studied, but my contention is that the studies have been superficial and largely repetitive. We recall the Gray report, the Rockefeller report, the Randall Commission, the Draper Committee and now the Clay Committee, and there undoubtedly have been others. Yet the problem is still with us. I believe the American Congress and the American public are growing restive under the burden of foreign aid and that the only way we will ever make any headway is through assembling the best brains we can find, both in the executive branch of the Government and private life, into a commission. With stature and independence and with an able staff, it could make a penetrating study and forthright and specific recommendations.

The difficulty with having studies made, either by officials in the executive branch or by a committee appointed by the executive branch, is that criticisms of operations of Executive agencies is likely to be inhibited.

The difficulty with having the study made by a congressional committee, and there are several which have adequate authority, is that Congress will not spend the money or take the time necessary for a penetrating study.

The Hoover Commissions on reorganization of the executive branch of the Government did have the stature, did acquire the staffs and were well worth the few millions they cost the American people. I believe that a study of foreign aid and the means of expanding the role of private capital in economic development overseas would well be worth its cost.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Does the commission, which the gentleman proposes, have sufficiently broad authority to cover such agencies as the Inter-American Bank, the proposed bank which would be set up for savings and loans and other financial institutions and programs in which the Government is interested?

Mr. MEADER. I think this commission has extremely broad study and investigative power.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman and compliment him on his idea.

Mr. MEADER. It would be composed of 12 members, 4 appointed by the President, 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 of whom would be members of the House, 1 from each party, and 2 would be appointed by the Speaker from private life, 1 from each party. Similarly the Vice President would appoint

four members on the part of the Senate.

I say that this program as administered has raised many questions in the minds of the American people. I have served for 10 years on a committee that has been investigating this program. We have had a very limited staff. I think we did a lot of good. But I know we did not get below the surface and we have not established any means of bringing this program to an end.

I think we cannot live with it indefinitely, especially if it continues to be administered in such a sloppy fashion.

This commission, if it did its job properly, could make an immeasurable contribution not only to our foreign policy but to a reduction of the tax burden on the American people.

I am thinking of a commission like the Hoover Commission. We had two Hoover Commissions, for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. They hired staff; they hired task forces; they went into these subjects in some depth. You cannot do that with a committee of Congress. It will not stay with it long enough. It will not hire sufficient staff to do the penetrating job that needs to be done.

This is a move in the direction of getting this program on the right track and I hope that the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to oppose the gentleman's amendment because I know that he has given a lot of study to this, and I know he is essentially and basically sincere in wanting to do something about it. But I think he is attacking it from the wrong angle.

I was chairman for 4 years of a select committee of this House to study unnecessary Government paper work and I want to say to you that after spending 4 years in that thankless task that I did not seek, I came to the conclusion that if this American Republic ever is destroyed it will be because we will be drowned in a lot of unnecessary paper.

We have had, as the gentleman named, all of the commissions that he referred to. I shall not go through them again, except to say that he left out one, the Draper Commission. They studied this and restudied it and issued reports, the latest of which was the Clay Committee report. And what happens? Very few people read the report, and fundamentally you get back to the fact that it is the business of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee, who have to make the decisions. That is basic. That is what happens.

In fact, the gentleman's proposal itself says that there shall be two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate on this Commission. Apparently they are going to be on still other committees. And the gentleman says that we do not have time enough now and we would expect them to serve on still another committee.

I think if there is anything we can do to cure this, we are trying to do it in the Foreign Affairs Committee by setting up these staff groups to go out and make

a study of this problem. We have cured a lot of this. I have been one of those who has advocated hiring more staff in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Basically it is our job and basically I think we are going to have to do it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I understand the point that the gentleman makes, but the thing that appealed to me about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is the fact that this was a commission which would cross committee lines, which was the point that I tried to bring out with my questions. Before the Banking and Currency Committee we have foreign financial relationships of our Government considered by the committee.

The same is true under other programs which come before your committee. The same is true of programs involved in taxation. A broad commission study of economic policy which I thought the gentleman's amendment was referring to and which appears to have much merit.

Mr. HAYS. What the gentleman says is true, but the gentleman has been in Congress before and the gentleman knows that no congressional committee, as jealous as they are of their prerogatives—the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Appropriations Committee—is going to let any outside commission do their work for them. This is just going to be another report which few people will read and even fewer will pay any attention to.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record. The gentleman said that the program was being administered in a sloppy manner. I think it is the impression of both sides of the Foreign Affairs Committee that the program has never been administered in a more able manner than under the distinguished leadership of David Bell, who has really identified himself and has really made this an efficient program along business lines.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with that part as far as Mr. Bell is concerned. But I think there is some justification, if I may rise to the defense of the gentleman from Michigan, when the gentleman says it has been in the past administered in a rather sloppy manner under, I might say, both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I cannot help saying to the gentleman that the conclusion to which the gentleman comes necessarily and logically leads to the conclusion that it is impossible for the Congress to do an overall examination and policy job, and I am unwilling to accept that conclusion.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think it is impossible for the Congress to do it at all. I think the Foreign Affairs Committee

has taken great steps in the last 2 years to do a more capable, comprehensive job. I will say to the gentleman that what I am saying is the Congress is not going to let some outside body do its work for it. If this commission is set up and if it submits a report, as I said earlier, hardly anyone is going to read it and even fewer are going to pay any attention to it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But, this is going to be a part of the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House ought to have the staff with which to make the study. The gentleman also sits on the Committee on House Administration and I am sure the gentleman knows that I have never been one who has been niggardly about providing funds for making committee studies, but we just will not do it. That is all. That is why we have resorted to establishing study commissions.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have given the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Government Operations, everything it has ever asked for, and the gentleman knows that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86-735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) In section 2 strike out "\$500,000,000" and substitute "\$700,000,000".

(b) Insert following the enacting clause "That this Act may be cited as 'the Latin American Development and Chilean Reconstruction Act'".

SEC. 402. (a) Section 101(f) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable from the Government or agencies thereof in the respective countries."

(b) Section 105 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this title in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States."

(c) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "economic development" and inserting in lieu thereof "economic and community development".

SEC. 403. (a) Section 571(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding the following: "Provided, That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made."

(b) Section 911(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after "on authorized home leave;" the following: "accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his

assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment, but in no case to exceed one member of his family."

(c) Title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out section 921(d), relating to use of Government vehicles, and by inserting immediately after section 913 the following new section:

"Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles"

"SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available."

(d) Title X of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART I—EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES"

"SEC. 1081. Whenever the Secretary determines that educational facilities are not available, or that existing educational facilities are inadequate, to meet the needs of children of American citizens stationed outside the United States engaged in carrying out Government activities, he is authorized, in such manner as he deems appropriate and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to establish, operate, and maintain primary schools, and school dormitories and related educational facilities for primary and secondary schools, outside the United States, or to make grants of funds for such purposes, or otherwise provide for such educational facilities. The provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended, and of paragraphs (h) and (i) of section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State,' approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170h(h) and 170h(i)), may be utilized by the Secretary in providing assistance for educational facilities. Assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, hiring, transporting, and payment of teachers and other necessary personnel."

SEC. 404. The Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170f-170t), is amended by inserting immediately after section 12 the following new section:

"Sec. 13. There is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of State, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses (including those authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended) and equipment, necessary for maintenance and operation in the city of Washington and elsewhere of (1) central reproduction, editorial, data processing, audiovisual, library and administrative support services; (2) central supply services for supplies and equipment (including repairs), and (3) such other administrative services as the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. Not to exceed \$150,000 in net assets shall be transferred to the fund for purposes of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of State, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will

approximate the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund."

SEC. 405. The first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", approved July 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 523), is amended to read as follows: "That not to exceed eighteen Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and annually with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area."

SEC. 406. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104(b)) is amended to read as follows: "There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs to be headed by an administrator with the title of Assistant Secretary of State and with compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State."

(2) The individual holding the position of administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not be required to be reappointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of the enactment of this section.

(b) (1) Clause (2) of section 104(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104(a)) is amended by striking out "Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(2) The heading of section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is amended by striking out "BUREAU OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS" and inserting in lieu thereof "BUREAU OF CONSULAR AND MIGRATION AFFAIRS".

(3) Section 101(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a) (1)) is amended by striking out "Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(4) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act which appears under the center heading

"TITLE I—GENERAL"

is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 104. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 104. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs."

(5) All provisions of laws of the United States which refer to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs shall hereafter be deemed to refer to such Bureau by the name of the "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as so redesignated by section 109(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 535), is hereby redesignated as subsection (i).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 25, strike out lines 3 through 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The individual holding the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not hold the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of his appointment to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs before such date of enactment, but shall be required to be appointed to the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, under the terms of this section of the act a reorganization has taken place which will create a new bureau, the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. It is provided in the bill, as now written, that the person appointed as administrator does not require reappointment but may serve without. My amendment would require the official to be appointed which would then logically assume that he would be required also to be confirmed by the Senate. I think this is a wise safeguard and is confirmed to this very important office. It is designed as a protective amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that this language which he seeks to amend is exactly the language which was passed by this House last year on March 14, 1962, as a section 406 of H.R. 7885. This amendment was written by Mr. Walter and his staff and the only dissent about it on that particular occasion, it did not become law because it did not pass the other body, was because I questioned the jurisdiction of it. Mr. Walter later came to me and said, there is a question of jurisdiction and I do not know whether it could ever be decided one way or the other. But we have the language and if you put it in some bill where it is appropriate and where it is legal, we will send it up to your committee. The language was submitted identically as Mr. Walter's staff member brought it to me. I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment because it seems as though the debate has degenerated to some sort of argument about the personality of the person who now holds the job.

This does not cost another dime. It merely redesignates and puts security where it ought to be, under the administrative officer and out of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. I would not know the present holder of that position if he walked in the door. As we say in Ohio, I would not know him from a truckload of stone. I am not interested in stone and I am not interested in personalities and I think that I agree with the gentleman it is proper that if he gets a new title at no increase in pay he be redesignated and he be reconfirmed. I think that indicates 99 per-

cent of the objections I have heard about it, and we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 24, beginning at line 19 and running through page 26, line 14, strike out all of section 406.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my objection to this section of this bill is the fact that in this foreign aid bill we are now creating another Assistant Secretary of State. There are now 11 Assistant Secretaries of State, and this will make it No. 12. I have searched the records of the hearings of the committee, and there is not a single word in the hearings as to why this assistant should be named or why there should be a 12th Assistant Secretary of State. It is not in the hearings. There is no way that the membership of this House can find out why we should have this Assistant Secretary of State. It seems to me that on the foreign aid bill we should confine ourselves to the matters that have to do with our mutual security, if you please, but that on questions of establishing a new division of the Department of State, they should come in here for full and complete hearings and the membership should have the advantage of hearings before the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs so we would know why we are doing it and what is being done and the purpose of it.

I think the gentleman from Ohio very properly said that some questions of personality are involved in this. I admit that the gentleman's amendment that says he shall be confirmed by the Senate helps somewhat, but the Senate already confirmed this man once. I just do not know what they are going to do unless we can develop it in full and complete hearings through the Committee on Foreign Affairs so that they can give Congress the reasons why we should establish this new office. I am a little bit concerned about this amendment which was accepted, because if you read it carefully, it says:

The individual holding the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not hold the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of his appointment to the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs before such date of enactment, but shall be required.

What does it say? It says he shall be required "to be appointed to the position." It does not take him out of office and tell him to go back to the Senate, but the language of this amendment which was accepted says, "but he shall be required to be appointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs."

So when you refer back to the language of this amendment, it does not do what they are trying to do, send him back for confirmation, but the language says that he shall be required to be appointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. This particular office will have to do with visas and with people coming into this country.

There are many things that he will have to decide. It seems to me we ought to take a good hard look at this question of whether or not we should create this office. It should be on proper hearings and determination by that committee and not in this bill in this manner when there have never been any hearings that Members could take advantage of.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, there have been some suggestions that have come to me that the language here incorporated is the sort of thing that out in Indiana once in awhile we have had in the legislature, known as the "ripper" bill, through which the name of an organization, a State agency is changed, everybody in that agency goes out and you pick a lot of new people.

I would like to inquire of the people in charge of this bill whether such an operation is contemplated by the language contained in the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, I would like to answer as honestly and as forthrightly as I know how the question of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. There is no intent as far as I know—and I suspect we are making legislative history—to have any "ripper" bill at all. I do not think there was that intent when Mr. Walter presented this and when it passed the House without a dissenting vote.

I will tell you what my mistake is, if any. I forgot to go—and I am going to keep right on forgetting—with matters under the jurisdiction of my committee and clear them with the distinguished gentleman on the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The facts of the matter are that we did have a hearing before the subcommittee on these amendments. They were unanimously approved by the full committee. This particular amendment does nothing except change the title of the gentleman who now occupies the office. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] says he is concerned with a lot of things. That is right, he is right now. He is running the Bureau. Changing his title without raising his salary does not do anything.

And he says—and I will make some more legislative history, if I may—that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana does not do what they say it does. The legal counsel says it does. The gentleman from Indiana who is a distinguished lawyer says it does. I am just a layman and I say it does.

Let me read the law now. This is the present law.

There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to be headed by an administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

That is what the law says. That is what the man is doing. That is the job he is filling. What does the new law or the proposed amendment say?

There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs to be headed by an administrator with the title of Assistant Secretary of State and with compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

One other thing that has already been accomplished by administrative order, and I think rightly so, is to take away from this very controversial fellow, whom I do not know—apparently he is controversial with some of my friends on the other side—the jurisdiction over security in the State Department and put it under the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security who reports directly to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

You can obscure it all you want to, but these are the facts. I submit to you that when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] OK's something, I think you know him well enough to know—some of you over there may not trust me, but, as I said, he is the ranking member on my subcommittee and everything that has come out of that committee this year and the last Congress, came out unanimously. As I said, if we had an amendment, we worked it out until we had a meeting of the minds. Another member of that subcommittee is the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, and former Governor of that State. When we reported out our bill on the buildings program, that was unanimous. He had an amendment and we worked it out.

I think these people know that there is not a "ripper" bill here, there is not any intent to get one, and there is no use beclouding the issue, because it just is not there.

May I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that I am glad the gentleman asked the question. I have given the gentleman an honest answer and that is the truth to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his forthrightness. I have had concern about some people down there who have been doing a real good job for the country and all of us, and I am glad to have that assurance.

Mr. HAYS. I may say to the gentleman that to my knowledge this is not a "ripper" bill. But I am not guaranteeing in perpetuity that nobody in this department will ever be removed or transferred. I am just saying that there is no intent here to get anybody about whom I know. I do not believe that is the reason they brought it in and I do not believe that is the reason Tad Walter brought it in last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. BOW. Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], has paid his compliments to me and I appreciate it. I shall not respond in kind. The gentleman has tried to lead this House to believe that you are not creating another Assistant Secretary of State by saying he is simply doing the work of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Let me read from your committee report:

The effect will be to increase the number of Assistant Secretaries of State from 11 to 12.

That is in the report.

Mr. HAYS. Nobody is denying that.

Mr. BOW. You are creating another Assistant Secretary of State. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] turn to his hearings and show us in those hearings where the gentleman took testimony to create this new division in the Department of State.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. It is not in the hearings, and I made that clear. There was a hearing before the subcommittee, but you are giving a paper argument and a phony one because we are creating an additional Assistant Secretary of State. I never said we were not. But, we are uncreating another job paying the same salary. So it is not costing a dime. Instead of calling him a director we will call him an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask one question now: Why do you want to create another Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, let me thank my anonymous friend when he responded with "why not." I do not think I can better that answer.

Mr. GROSS. Well, why not?

Mr. HAYS. Well, the gentleman knows as well as I know that there is an awful lot of protocol around this town and the best answer I could get from Mr. Walter last year was that this was to put him on a par with his peers who had this title and were doing the same work. If the gentleman will let me re-read what was said then—

Mr. GROSS. I heard the gentleman during the first reading.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to point out that the record does show that it is the creation of another Assistant Secretary of State. There is no question about this.

Mr. HAYS. Of course; that is right.

Mr. BOW. It seems to me that the gentleman's argument fails when he says that this was heard before the subcommittee. Well, of course, perhaps it was heard before the subcommittee, but are not the 435 Members of this House entitled to know from committee hearings why you created a new Assistant Secretary of State? Do we have the subcommittee hearings before us? I ask any Member of this House, have you had an

opportunity to read these hearings? Have they been before you? Do any of you know what testimony was taken on which to establish this other Secretary of State? I do not think that is the way we want to legislate. I think what we are entitled to is the same procedure as was followed in these other matters that were before this committee properly on foreign aid. The record is here. But there is no record before the 435 Members of this House to determine why we should do this.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly support the gentleman's amendment, if for no other reason than I have not been sold on the explanation that it is necessary to create another Secretary of State just to be fashionable or to keep up with the Joneses.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. HAYS. I want to say that I think there has been an adequate record made right here this evening for the defeat of the amendment. We do not need any further hearings on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 170; noes 160.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JENSEN

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 26, after line 14, insert the following new part:

"PART V

"In order to more directly, and thus more effectively, more efficiently, and more economically accomplish the humanitarian objectives of the United States, as set forth in the several policy provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, in aiding the underprivileged peoples of the less developed friendly countries of the world who are opposed to that theory of government known as communism and whose governments are in known opposition to that theory, and more particularly to secure the objectives designed to raise standards and conditions of living and thus enhance their health, welfare, and happiness, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, as an alternative to the several programs authorized for such purposes by this Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the sum of \$1,000,000,000 annually beginning with the fiscal year 1964 and continuing until the Congress determines that such objectives have been substantially accomplished or for other reasons determines such assistance no longer practicable or justifiable in the circumstances. Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended when so specified in the applicable appropriation acts.

"Of the sum appropriated for any year pursuant to the authorization herein, not less than 75 per centum, including necessary

administrative and distribution costs, shall be available solely for aid to such peoples in the forms of food, clothing, medicine, medical and nursing, and clinic and hospital services, as may be determined by the President. The remaining sum, including necessary administrative and distribution costs, shall be allocated in such manner as the President may determine for suitable low-cost housing for such peoples and, in countries whose economies are in major part agricultural, for supplying productive animal and poultry stock and housing and animal-drawn farm implements.

"The furnishing of such assistance shall be administered by such agencies of the United States Government as the President may designate, and under his general policy direction and control, but to the maximum extent practicable such assistance in the countries concerned shall be channeled to the people, as equitably as may be, and free of cost to them, through utilization of the advice, services, and facilities of the American Red Cross, the International Red Cross, American church missionaries in the countries concerned, and other voluntary non-profit organizations as may be designated by the President."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane as a substitute for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RAINS). It is evident from a reading of the amendment that the amendment is germane. The point of order is overruled.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to this foreign aid bill now being considered in the House is in effect a substitute for all the provisions in H.R. 7885, except the Purcell amendment which was adopted. I assure you I offer my substitute in all good faith. It speaks clearly for itself. When the foreign aid bill was first brought to the House, at the close of World War II, we were told that in 5 years, no more, the undeveloped nations would be sufficiently rehabilitated to care for themselves, hence I supported the program for the first 5 years. But not since that time.

We have up to this time appropriated and spent for this program over \$100 billion to the end that we now have a Federal deficit of over \$305 billion, which is considerably more than the Federal debt of all the nations of the world all put together.

Mr. Chairman, on my visits to many of the nations listed in the report on H.R. 7885, I learned firsthand by talking face to face with many needy people and others, that, when they learned we Americans were furnishing them with food, clothing, medicine, doctors, and nurses they were truly grateful, but too often they were not told of our generosity. If my substitute is made law those people will know, be grateful and friendly. It was disheartening to learn that some of those nations who accepted our military assistance reduced their defense budget by about an equal amount of our military assistance, with the thought in mind that should their country again become involved in a war, the American doughboy would again bail them out.

H.R. 7885 calls on our taxpayers to provide \$4,087 million for this program. My substitute provides for \$3,087 million less, which certainly should be saved. Think for a moment the good we could do for the needy people within our own shore, who number in the millions, with those billions, either in Federal aid or by reducing the President's huge budget for fiscal year 1964.

I sincerely hope my substitute bill will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. JENSEN and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided and there were—ayes 78, yeas 184.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TOLLEFSON

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOLLEFSON: Page 26, after line 14, insert a new section to read as follows:

"No funds shall be made available under the authorization provided in this act until unexpended appropriations made available under the previous authorization provided by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, have reduced to \$3,600,000,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, according to the Chairman, this is the last amendment that you will have an opportunity to vote upon and I shall be just as relieved as will you.

I do not expect the Committee to approve the amendment. I offer it primarily to advance and emphasize the thought that I have had in connection with the unfavorable balance of payments and the outflow of our gold. However, it is an amendment that those who oppose foreign aid can support very easily.

It could also easily be supported by those who favor foreign aid, without abandoning their views.

Mr. Chairman, putting the amendment simply, it simply provides that there shall be no appropriations under the authorization provided by this bill until the funds in the so-called pipeline are reduced to \$3.6 billion. It is a very simple amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members on both sides of the aisle who are worried about our unfavorable balance of payments and the outflow of our gold. From my point of view it is one of the most serious issues confronting us today. If we do not do something about it soon, we will not be able to carry out any foreign aid program for a very great length of time.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is an amendment that even our foreign recipient countries could support, if they had an opportunity to do so.

The amendment does not mean the abandonment of any foreign aid pro-

gram at all. It simply means a stretching out of it. We are all familiar with these stretched-out programs in other instances.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are aware of the fact that this administration, as well as the previous one, has taken steps to deal with the unfavorable balance-of-payments problem. But none of these steps have been very successful. In the last quarter the rate of unfavorable balance of payments has run or did run to the tune of \$5.2 billion, as I understand it. Now if we permit that kind of condition to exist for very long, then we will not for very long have any foreign aid program.

It seems to me that we ought to remember that the primary cause of our unfavorable balance of payments has been the foreign aid program itself.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman just made an unusual statement in which he stated that the foreign aid program was the cause of the unfavorable balance of payments.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Will the gentleman state his question again, please?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman says that the foreign aid program is the real cause of the unfavorable balance of payments. Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I did say that; yes, and I believe it to be so. I am not saying it is the sole cause. But I think the gentleman will agree with me that our trade balance is unfavorable.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, our foreign aid program does not make up the difference.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am not saying that it makes up the full difference.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the real culprit is our troops overseas, our tourists, and our investments overseas. The foreign aid program right now is really bringing in dollars to the United States. Foreign governments are buying with their own money \$1 billion worth of arms purchases, \$600 million from West Germany alone.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me ask the Chairman a question.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It is the Chairman's belief that the foreign aid program has not been contributing to the unfavorable balance of payments?

Mr. MORGAN. I say a small amount, only about \$1 billion, while tourist expenditures abroad account for \$2 billion.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I can justify it, if the gentleman wants to see the figures.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Not at this point. I do not have but about 2 minutes left and I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying if we want to deal with this unfavorable balance of payments, one way to do it is through the foreign aid program. I will grant you that a more practical way than this would be to limit the amount of expenditures per year under the foreign aid program to \$2 or \$2.5 billion a

year. Not only would it help our favorable unbalance, but it would also have an impact on this year's budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I do not expect the House is going to approve the amendment or that everyone in opposition to the foreign aid program can certainly support it. I advance the thought for your consideration in the months to come.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would be rather harmful to the foreign aid program. The basic question is the fact that you cannot divert those unfinished articles that are in the pipeline to meet new requirements which are not now anticipated. For example, such sophisticated weapons that our European allies may require cannot be diverted to provide rifles that might be needed in the Far East. If planes are on order you cannot use the obligated balance that remains in the pipeline for such purchases to be diverted for the purchase of machineguns or grenades.

That is the principal objection to the amendment and I therefore urge that it be defeated.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are now reaching the end of this debate. For all of the 13 years I have been in this Congress I have supported this program. This year I believe when it goes to a vote I am going to vote for it again with some reservations. Why? I know everybody has been wondering for 2 days why has this program been cut into so seriously. I think it gives us all pause for thought.

There are certain reasons here. I think there is the temper of the people in the country today toward this program which has been reflected in the votes that have been taken on amendments during the last 2 days.

May I say that when I came to the Congress and first considered this program we were in the midst of the Korean War. We had been thrown back at the Yalu River. At that time the program was in two parts. First, military assistance where subversion, sabotage, and armed resistance took place. The second part was to assist economically backward countries.

May I say to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, including my good friends on this side, there has been, in my opinion, a considerable slacking off by this administration in what I feel is strong opposition which would support this kind of a program. I am talking about open opposition to communism. There has been in my estimation during the past 6 months to a year many people in the Congress, including myself, who feel that this administration—and I am not trying to be partisan, I am trying to tell what I feel is the truth because I favored this program because I felt it had a value—there is a feeling there is a certain group in the White House and in the State Department whose response to communism has slackened off. I do not say it is necessarily the President himself. They are now trying to meet the issue of communism in a different

way rather than by resistance. I feel that this is a feeling which we have and which has resulted in these cut amendments on the foreign aid bill which comes about as the result of that type of thinking.

If this continues during the next year I hope those in the White House and in the State Department who are of this feeling, and they are there, because I have talked to them on the outlook they have with reference to this program, there will be a slackening in the support for this program.

The whole issue of fighting communism is not such that this program can be sustained indefinitely if that is going to be the general approach which is psychologically made to the whole question of whether or not we are going to oppose communism. That is why you are finding today a very deep opposition to this bill which I have never seen before in the 13 years I have been in Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Could anyone have expressed himself more forcefully about communism than did the President last year in the October confrontation?

He called the bluff of the Soviet Union. The first time it was ever done and I am certain that this accounts for the new Soviet attitude.

Mr. SPRINGER. They have not opposed communism in the manner that they should have. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion. I am trying to be constructive. I do feel that is the feeling of many in the Congress as reflected by votes on both sides of the aisle.

I do hope that there will be a change in the program. May I say to the gentlemen who are handling this in the State Department that it can be demonstrated that there is a genuine use for this program in fighting communism?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on this bill, I have made every effort to support the proposal as it was reported out of committee.

There is much room for criticism of our foreign aid program, and I believe that the administrators of the program should be held to account for their shortcomings and such failures as have occurred.

I am also aware of the pockets of blight and despair which exist in this country and very considerably in my own congressional district. In every way possible, I have endeavored to support a program to help eradicate domestic

blight and despair. However, we must not consider the complete solution of social problems in America as a condition precedent to our providing assistance to the world community of nations. I support help for the needy at home as well as those in foreign countries.

It is interesting to observe that many of those who align against aid for the needy in foreign lands also align themselves against aid for distressed Americans. They oppose acts of national charity because they contend that they are not received in gratitude. They would like to tattoo our giving on the body of every recipient. Like many givers, they want their giving carved in the marble of the cornerstone and painted on the windows. Such a gift is not a monument to charity, but a lasting memorial to avarice which is too often becoming the trademark of American benefaction.

Every man and every woman among us participates in charitable giving. Our best gifts carry no strings or accounting. Is it too much for this great and rich country to set aside 0.007 percent of its gross national product to the welfare of the less fortunate inhabitants of our world in these times? If America cannot participate in a concern for its neighbors, how then can any other nation?

I am gravely concerned with the growing crisis in the flight of gold. The situation calls for urgent modification of national policies. However, I do not believe that the termination of foreign aid is the proper solution. I am alarmed at the flight of gold but I am far more concerned with the flight of faith of those who still believe in the humanity of our democratic Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 493, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. BOW rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

SALUTE TO FREEDOM MARCHERS

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the impending August 28 civil rights march and rally, scheduled to occur in Washington exactly 1 week from today, compel me to speak in order that I may remind my colleagues in the House of Representatives of matters which will place that event in the proper perspective. It is not that I consider you uninformed on these matters, but only that I dare not remain silent lest some whom these words might reach should permit themselves to miss the point of the dramatic event. In view of our varied geographic, social and ethnic background, it would be all too easy to become so involved emotionally in a race-related issue that we would lose sight of substantive matters.

I have no doubt that you, my distinguished colleagues, are prepared to view the imminent civil rights march on Washington as an example of a traditional American medium of protest. I cannot conceive that anyone in this body would fail to see that this event is akin to numerous others of the same nature, except only that it occurs at a different and far more significant moment in our Nation's history. I will not believe that any Member would knowingly permit the color of the marchers' skins to so cloud his or her vision that it would be less than emphatically clear that the right of petition fully encompasses this form of articulating grievances.

I do not believe that anyone here doubts that Negroes in the United States have valid grievances against their Government; and against those private citizens who would treat them as second-class citizens. Nor is it credible that anyone here would contend, even in jest, that black Americans do not possess the same civil rights as other American citizens. I will not be convinced that anyone of my colleagues believes that anyone's rights can be possessed by another, to be patronizingly and paternalistically doled out to him as someone else sees fit to permit him to have them.

There is no question that human and civil rights are each person's possession equally; nor can there be any question as to the right to express, by public demonstration, the dissatisfaction of individuals and groups who have been denied the opportunity to exercise the rights which are theirs. The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, fully recognizes the right of advocates of racial equality to dramatize the cause publicly. President Kennedy is also aware that the contemporary plight of Negroes is such that demonstrations are fully justified. This view has also been expressed by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Attorney General Robert Kennedy, speaking for themselves and for the President.

The Congress and Washington have been the objects of massive protest dem-

onstrations on numerous occasions. The earliest recorded mass demonstration against the Congress was staged while the body was located in my own city of Philadelphia, in 1783. On that occasion, several hundred Philadelphia veterans of the American Revolution demanded their long-overdue pay from a Congress which presided over an empty treasury. The local citizenry and public officials were sympathetic to the veterans and the Congress sought protection from the threatening crowd by locking itself inside its chambers. It has been said that this event strengthened the Congress' resolve to relocate in a Federal city which would be under the control of that body.

In the wake of the panic of 1893, more than 1,500 unemployed persons descended upon Washington as a "living petition" in support of legislation originating with Joseph Coxey. "Coxey's Army," as the nucleus of the marchers was called, was further supported by over a thousand jobless men, all of whom actually assembled on the Capitol grounds where many of them were arrested for "walking on the grass."

On Monday, March 3, 1913, the Washington Evening Star reported that:

The modern crusade of votes for women this afternoon took Washington by storm.

The heading of the article referred to a "thrilling pageant" to the thousands of spectators who were "struck by the spirit and beauty of the occasion" and cheered "wildly." Following the opening sentence, quoted above, the item continued:

Marching determinedly along Pennsylvania Avenue with bands playing martial and religious music, 5,000 earnest women passed between solidly packed masses of humanity to emphasize their demand for suffrage through a constitutional amendment, while there were being enacted on the south steps of the Treasury building allegorical dances and tableaux interpreting the dreams and ambitions of militant womanhood.

And, further:

Reaching a climax in a giant mass meeting in Memorial Continental Hall late this afternoon, the great suffrage demonstration will pass into history as the greatest bids for public support ever made by any body of people.

And, elsewhere on the front page:

Trying their utmost to arouse enthusiasm for their cause, the suffragists lost no opportunity to press their arguments home. At every street corner suffrage orators delivered speeches, and all along Pennsylvania Avenue more than 50 girls "newsies" were at work selling suffrage newspapers, pamphlets, and magazines.

The assembly and demonstrations of March 1913, were followed up with another mobilization and rally in July of the same year. This time, the suffragists gathered in nearby Maryland and staged a motorcade into Washington, presenting woman suffrage petitions to the Congress and to President Wilson. Later, on January 10, 1917, the women began a month-long siege of the White House, braving the cruel elements through the winter, and eventually prevailing when the Congress passed the resolution proposing the 19th amendment which became effective in 1920. The 1917 campaign was highlighted by

severe police action against suffragettes who picketed the White House. Several were arrested and given "workhouse" sentences; but this served mainly to gain sympathy and support for the movement in the form of waves of protest against this sort of treatment.

Ten years later, in 1923, the first race-related mass protest occurred in Washington. The brilliant Negro Army officer, Col. Charles Young, had died and was being buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Colonel Young was then the highest ranking Negro in the Nation's armed services and had been shunted off to an obscure overseas post, by President Wilson, to avoid promoting him to the rank of general—a promotion which he had obviously earned but which he would not have received solely because he was a Negro. A reported 50,000 persons lined the streets of Washington, during the funeral, in protest against the treatment received by Colonel Young and which led to his death as a heartbroken man who had devoted his entire life to the defense of his country.

Washington Post reporter, Jean White, has written recently that:

As the Nation's Capital, Washington draws demonstrators who want to take their causes to the top. They have used the mass rally as well as the march to effect.

So it was in 1932 and 1933 when Armed Forces veterans marched in support of bonus legislation. The 1932 effort brought nearly 20,000 veterans and their families to the banks of the Potomac from which they were forcibly driven on instructions from President Hoover. The 1933 assembly was antilimactic since a bonus bill had already passed and compensation was to be paid a year or so later. Both demonstrations were orderly and nonviolent, except for the administration's reaction in using Armed Forces to disperse the visitors.

Since that time, virtually all large-scale marches on Washington have been associated with the Negro's struggle for equality of opportunity and treatment. In 1939, approximately 75,000 persons, white and Negro, gathered at the Lincoln Memorial for a civil rights rally that grew out of the refusal of the Daughters of the American Revolution to permit Negro contralto, Marian Anderson, to give a concert in their Constitution Hall.

The first planned Negro mobilization was initiated by Negro labor leader, A. Philip Randolph. That march on Washington movement gained such wide support and posed such an ominous wartime threat to domestic peace and unity that President Franklin Roosevelt headed the mobilization off by issuing, in 1942, his famous fair employment practices order, Executive Order 8802. The same Mr. Randolph, commonly referred to as the "dean" and "elder statesman" among contemporary Negro leaders, is serving as principal national director of the march scheduled for next week. The 1941-42 operation is the subject of a book by Myer Kesselman, entitled "The Social Politics of FEP."

In 1949, 5,000 civil rights crusaders appeared in Washington and petitioned

the Congress and President Truman for passage of a strong, major civil rights law. The following year, the NAACP staged a civil rights mobilization, to which most of its local branches sent certified delegates. Again, Congress and the President were urged to produce major civil rights legislation. A prayer pilgrimage, at which Dr. Martin Luther King was a principal speaker, brought over 20,000 demonstrators to Washington in support of the then proposed Civil Rights Act of 1957. The next year, a youth march on Washington movement, also supporting civil rights for Negroes, witnessed the assembly of more than 25,000 young Negro and white marchers. This was primarily a protest against the antics of Arkansas Gov. Orville Faubus, and the slowness of President Eisenhower to act against obstruction of desegregation at Little Rock's Central High School.

These 14 major demonstrations, involving several hundred thousand Americans over the years, have all been examples of the exercise of the right of petition by masses of people as compared with the more conventional, but not necessarily less effective, media and tactics of letters and visits to Congressmen and organized pressure group representation.

Except for the suffragette movement, all of the causes which produced marches on Washington were roundly criticized prior to, during, and after the demonstrations. The women's vote movement, however, was facilitated by a divided press, a part of which supported their drive for the elective franchise and was generous with its space in reporting either objectively or favorably the various activities of the women. Coxey's Army was employed by the Republican press of the 1890's as a weapon against the Cleveland administration; while the Democratic Party papers of that time referred to the Coxeyites as "professional tramps."

The usual criticism focused on predictions of violence and lawlessness, most frequently attributable to the demonstrators. Some charges of anarchy and communism were levied against the Coxeyites and the bonus expeditionary force of the 1930's, even as the Communist "red herring" has been dragged again and again across the path of the legitimate Negro rights crusade.

More than anything else, however, it has been the failure of the Congress and the President to act positively to remove the evils which produced demonstrations which has been responsible for virtually all of the extremism which has attended these activities. The Coxeyites, in desperation for recourse to remedy, sparked unlawful seizures of private property from sympathizers who smarted at the movement's failure. Likewise, the direct action protests by contemporary civil rights advocates is, as President Kennedy has stated, a result of the Nation's responsible agencies and leaders having failed to alleviate and eliminate the evils of segregation and racial discrimination fast enough and fully enough. While deploring the necessity of having to "take to the streets" in protest against deprivation of rights, the

President nevertheless realizes that, under present conditions, that has been the only course open to Negroes and supporters of their movement for racial equality. He has reminded the Congress, including our own chamber, ladies and gentlemen, that we have done next to nothing in discharging our responsibilities to the Negroes of our Nation. He has made it clear, too, that unless we do act to pass a comprehensive and remedial civil rights law, we can expect even more local and national demonstrations of greater magnitude and with more serious threats of violence than we have yet witnessed.

The August 28 march on Washington is symbolic of the Negro's struggle for freedom which dates from the time Negro slavery was first introduced into the American Colonies, in 1619. It is indicative of the Negro's final drive to realize the full promise of democracy which has been withheld cruelly and deliberately from him over a 100-year period during which he has been teased with mere tastes of freedom. It has implications for the inevitable and ultimate realization of equality, in search of which the Negro will never again retreat or even moderate his attitude and approach.

A. Philip Randolph, principal director of the 1963 march, speaking to a group of Senators and Representatives 2 weeks ago, spoke the pure, unadulterated truth when he said that:

There is an outcry [against racial injustice] from the longshoreman and the most educated doctor of philosophy, from the bottom of their hearts [saying] "I want to be free."

This is no hollow cry. It reflects the unrelenting determination, the complete dedication, the contagious resolve—the tenacity of the Negro people, singly and as a group, to achieve, at last, that measure of freedom and equality which the Constitution of the United States and the code of human decency dictate that they must and will attain.

But, to infer that this is only the Negro's fight is to lose sight of the larger context within which the equal rights social revolution is taking place. Does it alarm some of you, my distinguished colleagues, that I use the term "social revolution"? Are you disturbed, horrified, troubled or embarrassed by this terminology? I say this to you, it is a social revolution. The equal rights movement is effecting drastic and sudden changes in our society, yes, in our total civilization—changes which are so long overdue that the revolution for human status seems mild compared to what it might have been and what it will be if not consummated by corrective measures to that end. The inherent quality of man and the necessity of its being attained now is urgent. The cause can tolerate no further delay—cannot compromise with time or temper. The President realizes this and so do a majority of the Members of Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I appeal to you to examine your attitudes toward the August 28 march in term of the total cause of which that event is only a symbol. I urge you to take into consideration the fact that all men's civil and personal

rights are of paramount importance at present; that they are not at all subject to being rationed at the will of some so-called master group. I ask you to accept the inevitable; not because it is inevitable in its accomplishment, but because it is right and no other course will protect the Negro or the Nation's future.

I leave you with the question which the late Walter White, former NAACP executive secretary, a God-fearing leader, made the title of his posthumously published survey of race relations in the United States—"How Far the Promised Land?" To that question, however, I submit the only answer that fits present circumstances. The promised land is here—now, awaiting only the complete and immediate removal, by our fellow Americans, of the racial fence which has surrounded it and kept Negroes out for over 300 years.

SHEVCHENKO CHAMPION OF LIBERTY STAMP AND THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL IN WASHINGTON

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 21, 1963, groundbreaking ceremonies will be held in the Nation's Capital for the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. The event will take place on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW. Less than a year hence, specifically on Saturday, May 30, 1964, the unveiling of the statue will occur.

All this is in accordance with Public Law 86-749, which the 86th Congress enacted in August 1960. The Department of the Interior, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, has given this historic project its complete and superlative support. In addition, both the Commission on the Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission have given their warm approval to the proposed memorial.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 174

The 86th Congress performed an invaluable service to our national interest when it legislated the act permitting all Americans to honor the works and achievements of Shevchenko. This name is a historic symbol of freedom throughout Eastern Europe. Shevchenko wrote and worked in behalf of all the captive nations in the Tsarist Russian Empire. He fought not only for the independence of his own beloved Ukraine, but also for the national freedom of all the captive non-Russian nations in that empire. The spirit of his fight lives forcefully and brightly in the hearts of all the freedom-loving peoples in Eastern Europe today, who are under the yoke of the Soviet Russian imperial-colonialists. It was little wonder that

in 1960-61 Moscow and its puppets reacted vehemently and viciously against our congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress can properly crown this whole action by offering its support to the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in further honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, which, significantly, falls in 1964 when we shall witness the unveiling of his statue. Such broad congressional support for a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp would again demonstrate to the captive nations of Eastern Europe that the United States has no intention of remaining silent about their present captivity and their future liberation and freedom. The peoples of Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Georgia, Hungary, Armenia, East Germany and many other captive non-Russian nations will find their hopes revived and strengthened by this indicative action.

It has been my privilege to submit House Joint Resolution 174 which provides for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp in 1964. It would be most appropriate and also telling, to have such a stamp issued on the day the statue of this Ukrainian nationalist patriot is unveiled in this Capital of the free world. The compelling reasons for this issuance are well set forth in the joint resolution.

For the benefit of my colleagues I request that the full text of House Joint Resolution 174 be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, in the event that some may not be familiar with Shevchenko, I ask that the article by Robert J. Lewis on "An Idea Oversold?" which appeared in the October 28, 1962, issue of the Sunday Star and which vividly portrays the initial reaction of unfamiliarity, be printed in the Record. In addition, I request that the letter of support for House Joint Resolution 174 written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky in behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America also be printed. Finally, to give the broader picture of Soviet Russian imperial colonialism and the pertinence of my proposal to the captive status of Ukraine, I ask that following the above items, the recent lecture delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University be printed in the Record. Titled "Problems of Russian Communism," the lecture was given at the Institute on Communism at Central Missouri State College.

The resolution, article, letter, and address follow:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 174

Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth.

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of a monument to him on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its

colonial puppets against these farseeing acts clearly prove the wisdom of the U.S. Government in properly claiming this contemporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence the Champion of Liberty stamp series has become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties; and

Whereas in 1964 friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Shevchenko's birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to issue a champion of liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, fighter for freedom in Eastern Europe. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing in 1964 with the one hundred and fiftieth Shevchenko anniversary as the Postmaster General shall determine.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 23, 1962]

AN IDEA OVERSOLD?

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The affair of the Shevchenko statue showed, this week, that any idea can be oversold.

Until a few days ago, we had never heard the name Taras Shevchenko.

It bobbed up very quietly and—to us, at least—somewhat mysteriously. On a sheet of paper, we read:

"Taras Shevchenko statue—Commission approval of a site requested." It was on the list of matters to come before the National Capital Planning Commission last Thursday.

With the newspapers full of the news of Soviet activity in Cuba, we were a bit startled to see this item on the agenda.

A new statue to be erected to the memory of a Russian in Washington? How come? And why, at this particular time?

These, in a general way, were the kind of questions that crossed our mind.

We also got to thinking that here was just the kind of thing to turn Secretary of the Interior Udall apoplectic again. Hadn't he said Washington has too many statues already? If he didn't like the old statues of such American patriots as Dr. Benjamin Rush and William Jennings Bryan, what would he say about a new statue of Taras Shevchenko?

As it turned out, these preconceptions about both Taras Shevchenko and Mr. Udall were dead wrong.

In the first place, Mr. Shevchenko was not a Russian at all. He was a native of the Ukraine, a separate country now, within the Soviet Union in somewhat the same way that Algeria once was a part of Metropolitan France.

In the second place, Secretary Udall's own aids had chosen a site for a Shevchenko statue. It was the Secretary, himself, who was asking the planning commission to give approval so the memorial could be built.

Beyond all that, Taras Shevchenko—poet laureate of his native land—was one of the world's most notable symbols of man's desire to be free.

Ever since his death, 101 years ago, his writings have helped keep alive the desire of Ukrainians for personal liberty—and for national independence.

Just 2 years ago, Congress directed Secretary Udall to select a site for a memorial to this man who—said a joint resolution of the House and Senate—"was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land."

In deciding there should be a memorial in Washington to Shevchenko, Congress was making clear to the Ukrainian people—and to the world in general—that it was honoring a contemporary of our own Abraham Lincoln. It was demonstrating another value of statutes, too, for statutes commemorate ideas as well as men.

In a congressional publication (H. Doc. No. 445, 86th Cong.) entitled "Taras Shevchenko: Europe's Freedom Fighter," there appears this statement:

"One need only to delve into the record of the anti-Communist and anti-imperialist resistance on the part of the Ukrainian nation from 1918 to the present date in order to grasp the full meaning of Shevchenko. In the incessant cold war, it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation."

At Thursday's meeting, the planning commission somehow knew less about the congressional document than about Secretary Udall's earlier opposition to statutes. Members didn't seem to understand why another statue was needed now when, all along, Mr. Udall had been saying there was an overabundance of them.

So that site he chose in Rock Creek Park, just east of the P Street bridge, was not approved. Which goes to show that even opposition to statutes can sometimes be carried too far. Even Mr. Udall would probably now agree to that.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., August 14, 1963.

HON. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its membership I warmly express our profoundest gratitude for your strong sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174 which provides for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. You have our complete support and backing in this extremely important cultural project.

Next month, in accordance with Public Law 86-749, ground-breaking ceremonies will take place on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., Washington, D.C., in preparation for the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue next year. This event on September 21, 1963, will appropriately feature your splendid action in behalf of Ukraine's poet laureate and Europe's freedom fighter.

With 1964 as the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth, we enthusiastically look forward to the issuance of the Champion of Liberty stamp in his honor at the time of the statue's unveiling. Congress in its wisdom saw fit to provide for the erection of a statue honoring this great

adversary of traditional Russian imperialism. We sincerely hope the present administration will similarly honor his historic contributions to national and human freedom in Eastern Europe by arranging for the stamp issue on May 30, 1964, the unveiling date. It is would, by itself, be an enormous contribution to peace and understanding between our country and the 45 million people of the Ukrainian nation, not to mention millions of others in Eastern Europe.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

PROBLEMS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

(Lecture by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University)

Every body politic has problems. This has always been; it will always be. We in the United States are beset with a full spectrum of problems, ranging from a shot to the moon to the employment of every willing and able worker. The Soviet Union has even greater problems, not only those normally associated with day-to-day existence in a developing industrial society but also—indeed more so—those created by the totalitarian goals, drives, and energies of what is commonly called Russian communism.

In a valid sense, then the problems of Russian communism, totalitarian in nature and scope, constitute an additional layer to the everyday problems engulfing those who are directly or indirectly under the influence of Moscow. Yes, there are problems of juvenile delinquency, skilled labor shortages, alcoholism, urban development and a host of other socio-economic phenomena as there are here and in numerous other countries. But to pose these as the distinctive, direct problems of Russian communism would mean to lose sight of the forest because of the trees. To be sure, in any totalitarian framework the impact of broader, overall problems is felt in the lower range of particular, day-to-day problems—creating some, sustaining others, and intensifying most. But to comprehend as best we could the total, integrated picture of the problems of Russian communism, it is necessary to distinguish between the truly totalistic problems and the particular derivative problems, with primary concentration on the former.

On this methodological note, permit me to congratulate most warmly those responsible for this Institute on Communism and also to felicitate you on your serious study of communism and all that it involves. In substance, there is no greater contribution to the continued growth, security, and enlightened leadership of our Nation than this, a forum of discussion and exchanged ideas about a phenomenon that unremittingly threatens the values and foundations of our civilization. For the survival of these values it is imperative that we come to understand the nature of this threat and the paramount problems our chief adversary seeks to resolve for our destruction.

Methodically, then, for us to view the picture of the problems of Russian communism as an integrated whole, we shall survey six selective categories, each in turn predicated a variety of interrelated problems. More, to assess the meaning of these aggregate problems both for the achievement of Moscow's goals and the realization of capable responses on our part, we shall throughout stress their operational significance in the context of traditional Russian cold war activity. A more detailed elaboration of this operational dimension will be given on my second round here.

THE IDEOLOGICO-PROPAGANDA PROBLEM

The six problem areas for our analysis are: (1) the ideologico-propaganda (2) the imperio-colonial (3) the economic area (4)

the military-space field (5) the party apparatus and (6) Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Let us consider the first, the ideologico-propaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda drive is admitted as being superior by most students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

With his grandiloquence and constant babble Khrushchev has enlarged this ideologico-propaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of "peaceful coexistence" which, by definition, means cold war and eventual Soviet Russian takeover right down the line. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the new order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is "the Soviets"—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of superreligious Orthodoxy and racist Pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4-footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as mere propaganda, while, on the other hand, we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the problems of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. How often have you

heard about Communist indoctrination of the youth and a captive population? Well, after 20 years of so-called indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting "Russky go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom.

Month after month, Pravda and Izvestia hammer away at the need for heavy indoctrination in the schools, in the armed services, and in the republics to overcome what is in effect hollow babble. On Lenin's birthday this year, B. N. Ponomarev, the party historian and secretary of the Central Committee, delivered an address designed to justify Soviet Russian policy under Khrushchev. The basic principles of revolutionary theory, he said, "are loyalty toward Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against any attempt to revise it; creative development of Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against the dogmatic strangulation of the theory; indissoluble union between theory and practice, their organic unity within the scope of all party activities." In other words, like Lenin with Marx, Khrushchev can interpret Lenin as conditions warrant it.

These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without iron, bamboo, and sugar curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan Horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to recognize its own problems in waging this ideologico-propaganda offensive. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of recognizing and aggravating these problems in the U.S.S.R. For example, 5 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.¹ It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples under the heel of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism listen in the language of their Moscow captor.

The opportunities for projecting the ideologico-propaganda problems of Moscow are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vacuity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, surplus value, economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer puts it, "Bolshevism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instru-

ment of its own will to 'change the world'."² The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of backward and barbarian Russian institutions.³ The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule. Make no mistake about this. This is not a matter of academic theorization and speculation. As I'll show in connection with our second area, it has been successfully tested and, indeed, more tests are in order so that this fundamental truth would be ingrained in the minds of our people and the people of the world. It is scarcely comforting to learn, alas, that we are fighting against a mythology, but it is reassuring to know that along with all the captive nations in Moscow's empire we have pierced through the mythological facade of communism to the real enemy, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. The evidence on Moscow's deep sensitivity to this penetration is more than abundant.

Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the Declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.⁴ The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee in August 1961, that Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders, many of whom are today seeking a non-aggression pact with Moscow and a virtual sellout of the captive nations.⁵ Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an "Independent Ukrainian Republic," about an Armenia that "declared its independence" in 1918, about "the independent state of Georgia."⁶ It is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from recognizing the problem Moscow has in shielding its backward imperio-colonialism with Marxist ideology. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains, and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known."⁷

THE IMPERIO-COLONIAL PROBLEM

Well, how about Soviet Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's

¹ Lichtheim, George. "Marxian, An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

² Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism, a New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85-86.

³ "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953.

⁴ "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3583.

⁵ "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3568.

⁶ Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

⁷ "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102-122.

foremost problems is its tremendous empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China, Albania, and Rumania, about "the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc," the Soviet Russian empire continues to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic coordination, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.⁸ The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula "national in form, socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and elsewhere to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than "the imperialist powers" of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukrainians, for example, about the German atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of Pan-Slavism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Disagreement with Red China, Rumania or Albania is more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency.

What most of us fail to see is the fact that the present Sino-Russian rift is only another chapter in the long history of Communist Parties' conflicts. In the 1920's and 1930's, it was between the Russian Communist Party and many non-Russian Communist Parties of the present Republics in the U.S.S.R.; in the 1940's and 1950's between Moscow and Tito and Gomulka; now in the 1960's between Moscow and Peiping. And in all the ideological lash was used to express national interests. There really has never been a monolith in the Soviet Russian empire, whether in the U.S.S.R. itself or beyond. Thus, for example, whether in Georgia or Azerbaijan, Ukraine or Turkestan, Khrushchev often has tried to persuade the non-Russian nationals there that they are "free and independent." And these nationals amount to over half of U.S.S.R.'s 225 million population.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems

at Stalin's death, during the Hungarian revolution, but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet ingrained in this imperial power and strength lies the most profound problem of the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists. This fundamental problem revolves about the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism, both within and outside the Soviet Union. This problem is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.⁹ It is this power of patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets, junior partners, and the prime power.

Despite the unmistakable clues given by Khrushchev himself, we have yet to translate this basic problem for general American understanding. The most important and conclusive test of my observation here is Khrushchev's haunting fear of any implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Our President and others have spoken in behalf of some of the captive nations before 1959, but this produced no sensitive reaction from Moscow. It was only when Congress included all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union, that Khrushchev and his puppets exploded. And they have been erupting over this ever since because they know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

Just a few examples on this. In the Soviet Russian weekly, the New Times, a question was hard pressed last January 23, "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question." From 1957 to the present Moscow's cardinal objective has been American acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe and Asia. This is the prime motive behind Khrushchev's insistence on a non-aggression pact to smooth the way for Moscow's controlled exploitation of nationalist forces throughout Eurasia. Whether we'll assist him with this fundamental problem is the momentous question of our day.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

Turning now to the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure, and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning, a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our gross national product, with an industrial output of about 50 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 40 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth being experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a cold war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as \$12 to \$20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot "liberation" war purposes.

⁸ Dobriansky, Lev E., "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14-22.

⁹ George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

Problems in this unbalanced economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. What the average factory worker in the United States receives in 1 week—a little over \$100—exceeds the average monthly wage in the U.S.S.R., about \$85.

Although living standards have improved in the last 6 years, they are far below those of any modern industrial economy. The shortage of adequate housing space, not to mention facilities, remains acute; and if the present 7-year plan succeeds, the average family in a large city would have about the same living space in 1965 that its forebears had in 1917. In 1961, upon announcing the 20-year-draft plan, Khrushchev promised that by 1980 every newly married couple could expect a private apartment of its own.

Such basic maladjustments exist throughout this cold war-oriented economy—in industrial and agricultural production, transportation, communications, distribution, and economic organization. No doubt there are units in each that compare efficiently and brilliantly with the best plants we have. But unless we are wont to be deceived by Russian economic potemkinism, every sphere lacks depth and proportionality in what for years has been a capital overstrained economy. This strain showed itself in 1961 with a marked decrease in the growth rate, that in 1962 is estimated to have been less than 4 percent.

To relieve this strain, to meet consumer expectations in some degree, and yet to pursue the cold war under the cover of "peaceful coexistence" is Moscow's present objective. This forms part of the explanation for its signing the limited nuclear test-ban treaty. It also explains its accommodation of national pressures for coordination as against integration in the planning activities of Comecon.

In combination with these problems, the pressures exerted by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. for a greater take in the economic pie represent nationalist resistance to Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. Moscow is now decrying "localism" and has launched another economic reorganization that has all the marks of Russification for the Baltic, Caucasian, and Turkestan areas. These basic problems deserve our concentrated cold war attention.

Again, to cite an example, there are today some 40 resolutions in the House Rules Committee calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.¹⁰ One of the main objectives of this committee would be to study and make known the scope and depth of Moscow's economic colonialism in the Soviet Union. These measures seek to implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution, but so far the leadership and the administration have resisted such a step, this despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such implementations.¹¹

THE MILITARY-SPACE PROBLEMS

Contributing to the capital overstrain in the U.S.S.R. economy are the military-space problems facing Moscow. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in

¹⁰ "Action On The Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, pp. 15376-15378.

¹¹ See "Russian Colonialism And the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518-3544.

dollar volume our total military expenditures, over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called socialist economy or Communist pretension. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

Behind the military technocracy in the U.S.S.R., which for general economic reasons will be somewhat shortened soon, lie deep problems that no amount of nuclear blackmail or military display can hide. Before World War I the Russian czar virtually terrorized the capitals of Western Europe with the threat of the great Russian "steam-roller," the vast imperial forces of the Russian Empire. Today, following in the paved traditions of Russian cold war diplomacy, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of nuclearitis as an excuse for the absence of a well defined and developed cold war policy.¹²

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent problems in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two World Wars political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations accounted for this record. About 43 percent of U.S.S.R.'s armed forces is non-Russian and despite the fact that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Our capitalization of this deep-seated problem rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. Disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potenkinize their fists and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no commonsense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludible from the Russian cold war matrix.

THE PARTY APPARATUS

Another major problem area is the party apparatus. Not unlike the Nazi Party under

Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 9 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives, and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and for subversive conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without problems that, along with others, could not be worked on. The perennial problem of succession, intra-party feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one problem as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major problems is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Can you now understand why for 4 years Khrushchev and his puppets have been violently attacking the Captive Nations Week resolution?

SOVIET RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

The final and perhaps cardinal problem of Russian communism is the maintenance of its nexus between Soviet Russian expansionism and internal totalitarianism. The former continues unabated by push and accomplishment, as in the case of Cuba. And, contrary to the false notion of progressive mellowism in the U.S.S.R., the latter is kept intact. Aside from terrorism, the totalitarian reins in the U.S.S.R. are as strong as ever. There is no evidence of any democratization under Khrushchev, and allowable criticism is more administrative than institutional. As Khrushchev said in 1957, "I . . . would to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought." Logically, to allow any institutional democratization, Moscow would be consigning its whole imperial structure, including the U.S.S.R., to limbo. But this logic is no reason for us to hesitate in the enlargement of this problem by actively generating pressures within the U.S.S.R. toward the civil and political freedoms of the Russian people and the national freedoms of the non-Russian nations.

In short, the permanence of the cold war and the basic fixity of Soviet Russian totalitarianism are indispensable requisites to the preservation of Moscow's imperial domain, within and beyond the U.S.S.R. A limited nuclear test ban treaty is not even a shaft of light pointing to any cessation of the cold war. In fact, as Moscow proceeds to put its house in order by solving the major problems described here and with the Sino-Russian imperialist rift deepening, we can look forward to more intense cold war efforts in the free world—this, of course, under the banner of "peaceful coexistence."

NEED FOR GENERAL LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RESERVED MINERAL RIGHTS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to

the surface owners of land, certain mineral interests reserved to the United States. The particular mineral interests, which are administered by the Secretary of the Interior, were reserved to the United States when lands that had been acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the resettlement laws, and emergency relief appropriations acts of the 1930's were sold.

From time to time we have had private bills before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of this body to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell the reserved mineral interests in this circumstance to a particular owner of the surface. Three such bills have been reported favorably by our committee during this Congress, two have passed the House, and the third (S. 1154) is on the Consent Calendar.

In order to avoid a multiplicity of individual bills in this category, I have introduced a general bill. My bill would confer authority on the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the surface owner the mineral interests I have described above but only on condition that, first, there is no U.S. mineral lease outstanding; second, the conveyance is made on payment of fair market value; and third, the purchaser, in addition to the purchase price, reimburses the Government for its administrative cost in making the conveyance.

A further examination of the background will, I submit, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate the desirability of this general legislation. I have been informed that under the Bankhead Jones Farm Tenant Act there was a requirement that the United States retain a 75-percent interest in the mineral rights. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture, by regulation, required that, in a disposal of lands at resettlement projects and of land acquired pursuant to emergency relief measures, a determination be made of whether the lands have a mineral potential and, if so, to reserve all the mineral interests.

At this point we should understand that the lands involved were originally privately owned and came into Government ownership pursuant to the various assistance programs that I have referred to, that were designed to help in the stabilization of our economy during the depression of the 1930's. Having acquired the land, there was a fear that windfall benefits might accrue to purchasers from the Government if the mineral interest was not reserved to the United States.

However, in 1950, realizing that the reservation of the mineral interests in the United States impeded utilization of the lands, Congress, by the act of September 6, 1950—64 Stat. 769—established a 7-year period for the sale of mineral interests reserved or acquired by the United States or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation under programs administered by the Resettlement Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Specific provision was made for the transfer of the mineral interests for \$1 in areas where "there is no

¹² E.g., text of President's news conference, the Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1962, Washington, D.C.

active mineral development or leasing." At the end of the 7-year period the mineral interests still retained by the United States under the aforementioned programs were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior "to be administered under the mineral laws of the United States."

In hearings before the Interior Committee, we have been advised that in connection with programs of the Farmers Home Administration there were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior mineral interests in approximately 3,800 tracts and that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation transferred approximately 9,900 mineral interests for administration by the Interior Department—the Farmers Home Administration having disposed of mineral interests in approximately 5,900 tracts and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation having disposed of mineral interests in approximately 8,552 tracts.

I realize that it is speculative, but my guess is that, in the areas where there was no mineral activity, the people did not think that the mineral interests reserved by the United States presented an impediment to their title or use of the property. Now we find, in the cases that have come before our committee, the changing uses of land have made some of the farms valuable for development in other ways. As a result, the outstanding mineral reservation in the United States effectively precludes financing because a lending institution is naturally hesitant to loan money for the construction of a building that might have to give way for mineral development, even though the likelihood of such development is remote.

Another thing that we have found is that owners of the surface were not always aware of the right to purchase reserved minerals during the 1950-57 period.

It is submitted that it is fair and logical, as well as in the economic interest of the country, to encourage lands to be developed and utilized for their highest and best use. Accordingly, there is no reason for the United States to continue to hold the mineral interests in privately owned land where there are no minerals being developed.

The bill I have introduced today will permit the sale of the mineral interests to the surface owner in any case that was authorized for sale in the act of September 6, 1950, subject to the restriction that the sale would not be allowed if, in the meantime, the United States had entered into a mineral lease. Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill protects the interest of the United States by requiring payment of full market value plus reimbursement of the Government costs.

ISRAEL ASKS U.N. TO MEET ON SYRIA

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Near East on the Israel-Syrian border at the Israel border settlement at Almogor are a matter of concern.

This morning, there are reports that the United Arab Republic has placed its armed forces on "emergency alert" and that Iraq has placed her armed forces "under Syrian command."

It is my understanding that Gen. Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization is in Damascus today and that in New York the Security Council is being polled as to the advisability of calling a meeting of the Security Council.

It is my hope that the United States will urge a prompt calling of the Council to ascertain the facts concerning the Syrian ambush of Israelis—fatal to two—Monday night; the subsequent exchange of fire on the border and the aerial incident of Tuesday. It would be my hope that the Council would also assess responsibility for the violation or violators of the armistice agreement involved.

Prompt action by the Security Council could be central to keeping the peace and to the prevention of the escalation of this situation into serious hostilities.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1963]
ISRAEL ASKS U.N. TO MEET ON SYRIA—APPEALS TO COUNCIL TO CURB "AGGRESSION" ON BORDER

(By W. Granger Blair)

JERUSALEM (Israeli Sector), August 20—Israel accused Syria of aggression today and asked the United Nations Security Council to meet in urgent session.

Syrian and Israeli forces exchanged fire throughout the afternoon in the area of Ashmura, a border farm settlement in the demilitarized zone 10 miles north of the Sea of Galilee.

The army announced that two Israeli Mirage Jet fighters had attacked and damaged one of at least six Syrian MIG-17 jets that entered Israeli airspace over the demilitarized zone on the southeast shore of the Sea of Galilee. It was the first time the Mirages, recently acquired from France, had seen combat.

The Cabinet met to consider "a grave threat to peace" in the area, Haim Yahlil, director general of the Foreign Ministry, said at a news conference tonight: "We feel there is a real danger to peace if the Syrian actions do not stop."

The Government acted after two Israelis were killed yesterday by Syrian armed forces that apparently entered Israeli territory in the Jordan Valley just north of the Sea of Galilee.

The emergency Cabinet session was brief. When it ended, the Government instructed its delegation at the United Nations to request the Security Council session, citing a "grave act of aggression by Syrian armed forces."

Mr. Yahlil asserted that "urgent action" by the United Nations was "absolutely essential" if a more serious situation was to be averted.

ACCEPTANCE IS CONDITIONAL

As a step to restoring peace on Israel's northern frontier with Syria, Lt. Gen. Odd Bull, head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, proposed to Israel today that the United Nations inspect the length of the Israeli-Syrian frontier to a depth of 6½ miles on each side of the border. The object would be to ascertain if there have been military concentrations in violation of the Israeli-Syrian armistice agreement.

Israel accepted the proposal tonight on condition that simultaneous inspection take place in the Syrian zone. The Syrian reply to the proposal had not yet been received by General Bull, according to sources.

Mrs. Golda Meir, Israel's Foreign Minister, received Ambassador Vincente Gerbas of Venezuela and Spencer Barnes, chargé d'affaires of the United States Embassy, to inform them of the situation and to ask urgent action by the United Nations.

The United States and Venezuela are members of the Security Council. Mrs. Meir will meet the diplomatic representatives of eight of the nine other countries on the Council tomorrow. The ninth is Morocco, a Moslem state without representation in Israel.

SYRIANS REPORT BATTLE

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, August 20.—A machine-gun battle lasting 2¼ hours broke out on the Syrian-Israeli border today as 15 Israeli armored vehicles opened fire on Syrian outposts, an army spokesman announced.

He said Syria had filed an urgent complaint with the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

SESSION EXPECTED THIS WEEK

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 20.—A meeting of the Security Council is expected to be called for Thursday or Friday to act on Israel's complaint against Syria, United Nations sources said today. The possibility was seen that Syria might bring a countercharge against Israel.

The last time the Security * * * a flare-up of Syrian-Israeli troubles was in March 1962, when the uneasy peace along the border erupted into an open clash, also in the Galilee area.

APPEALS HELD FUTILE

In recent years, Israel has tended to look on appeals to the Council as futile since any resolution unfriendly to the Arab States would be vetoed by the Soviet Union.

The new request to the Council was viewed here partly as a reflection of increased internal pressure on the government of Premier Levi Eshkol to deal firmly with the Syrian situation. The government apparently is also mindful of the criticism that has been directed at Israel in the past for taking reprisal measures rather than appealing to the Council.

The present appeal would serve at least to call world attention to the Syrian situation, even if more effective measures were blocked by Soviet veto.

The Council session will be the 1,057th to deal with some facet of the troubles between Israel and the Arab nations since the signing of the armistice agreements in 1949. Technically, a state of war still exists.

BACKING OF UNITED STATES SOUGHT

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Israel called on the United States tonight to support its request for an emergency session of the United Nations Security Council. Avraham Harman, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, made the request during a meeting with Howard R. Cottam, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

State Department sources indicated that the United States was in favor of a Security Council meeting.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1963]
NASSER'S FORCES ARE PUT ON ALERT AT ISRAEL BORDER

CAIRO, August 21.—The armed forces of the United Arab Republic were put on an emergency alert today to face "Israeli aggression against Syria," the Middle East News Agency reported tonight.

The Arab League was consulting on a "unified Arab plan" following receipt of a

note on what Damascus called "Israeli aggression" from the Syrian Foreign Ministry, the agency reported.

Meanwhile, Maj. Gen. Odd Bull, Norwegian chief of staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, arrived in Damascus from Jordan to discuss the subject of the border clashes with Syrian authorities. A United Nations spokesman said the border situation was quiet during the day.

In Amman, Jordan, Premier Sherif Hussein ben Nasser said his country always considered the armistice border between Arab countries and Israel an Arab defense line and any aggression would be considered a collective act against the Arab world.

SYRIA GETS IRAQI AID

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, August 21.—Iraq placed her armed forces today under Syrian command to support Syria in the armed crisis with Israel.

Reports from Baghdad said that the Iraqi Government had placed territory adjoining Syria under military emergency.

Iraq's forces in this area, west of the Euphrates River, have been put on alert to answer any call for their service from Syria.

The Syrian Premier, Salah elBitar, called in the Ambassadors of the United Nations Security Council members—including those of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France—and gave them Syria's version of the air and land battles that flared along the armistice line yesterday.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the Syrian Government also sent a telegram to the Arab League in Cairo demanding a unified Arab stand behind Syria to face "all possible eventualities" along the 70-mile demarcation line.

Syria and Iraq are parties to the Arab League Joint Defense and Economic Cooperation Treaty. The treaty says that armed aggression against one of its parties is to be considered as aggression against them all. Other members of the Arab League include the United Arab Republic, Lebanon and Yemen.

Syria called the border tension and yesterday's fighting "premeditated Israel aggression."

The United Arab Republic, despite its political feud with Syria, already has pledged support against Israel. Jordan and Saudi Arabia set aside their longstanding differences with Damascus to promise support.

The Iraqi gesture seemed to signify moral support more than military assistance. More than half of Iraq's army and a substantial part of her air force already are committed to war against rebellious Kurdish tribes in northern Iraq.

Whether Iraq could actually spare soldiers or planes to move into Syria was questionable.

The diplomatic moves came a day after Israeli and Syrian jet fighters battled over the tense truce line north of the Sea of Galilee. Ground forces also exchanged fire.

IRAQI FORCES ON ALERT

BEIRUT, LEBANON, August 21.—Iraq placed her armed forces in a state of alert today with orders to be ready to move immediately to assist Syria against Israel if the need arose.

A statement by the Iraqi Revolutionary Council broadcast by the Baghdad radio said: "Israeli aggression against our sister Syria cannot be tolerated." The council, the highest authority in the country, declared that it was placing Iraqi troops at the disposal of the Syrian Revolutionary Council.

The Iraqi Defense Minister, Brig. Saleh Mahdi Anash, put all military airports west of the Euphrates River, the area bordering Syria, in a state of emergency. All aircraft at these airports were ordered to be at the runways and ready to take off immediately.

Brig. Abdel Ghani Rawi was appointed commander in chief of all Iraqi forces west of the Euphrates.

ISRAEL WARNS OF RETALIATION

(By W. Granger Blair)

JERUSALEM, (ISRAEL SECTOR), August 21.—Israel will forcefully retaliate against Syria if there is "one more serious incident" along the northern border between the two countries.

This was reported on reliable authority to be the position of the Israeli Government in the wake of Israel's charge of aggression against Syria. It followed the border killing of two Israelis, both 19 years old, in an ambush on Israel soil Monday night.

Israel has called for an urgent session of the United Nations Security Council. She is understood to want a strong and speedy condemnation of Syria on the ambush charge.

Yesterday, Israeli and Syria forces exchanged fire all afternoon in the demilitarized zone 10 miles north of the Sea of Galilee. The Israelis said their jets attacked and damaged a Syrian jet in Israel airspace.

FRONTIER IS QUIET

The Israel-Syrian frontier was quiet today, but diplomatic and political activity was intense.

Foreign Minister Golda Meir, who had seen the United States and Venezuelan diplomatic representatives yesterday, saw representatives of seven of the remaining nine member nations of the Security Council today.

The two she did not see were those of Nationalist China and Morocco. Neither of these Governments has diplomatic missions in Israel. Mrs. Meir conveyed the Israel position to the diplomats she saw.

The foreign affairs and security committee of the Knesset (Parliament) met in urgent session today to discuss the situation.

According to a Government statement, it was stressed during the committee discussion that "if the Security Council does not fulfill its duty to take steps to stop the aggression, Israel will consider it their duty to act in accordance with her right of self-defense that is reserved to every sovereign state."

A list of 98 alleged instances of border harassments by Syrians between December 4 and yesterday has been prepared by the Government for the Security Council. The Israeli will also condemn the Syrian seizure July 13 of six excursionists—three Israelis and three Belgians—on the Sea of Galilee.

The Belgians have been released but protracted negotiations to obtain freedom for the Israelis have so far been unsuccessful.

ADMISSION TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 7, 1963, on the floor of the House of Representatives, I discussed information which had come to members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee regarding certain recommendations to change the procedures for admittance to the service academies. Yesterday I received a letter from Adam Yarmolinsky of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in which he states that he at no time has recommended that

"college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance to the Academy be set aside so that special examinations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment." It is now my understanding that Mr. Yarmolinsky's recommendation merely related to the establishment of special classes and special tutoring so that all groups who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities would have an opportunity to compete on an equal basis in the academies' open competitive examinations.

I appreciate very much receiving this information from Mr. Yarmolinsky and ask unanimous consent that his letter addressed to me on August 15, 1963, may appear at this point in the Record.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D.C., August 15, 1963.

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: Last Tuesday, on the floor of the House you said, "It was just 2 years ago that Adam Yarmolinsky made a recommendation to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel that the procedures for admittance to the service academies, particularly Annapolis, be changed so that the college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance to the Academy be set aside so that special examinations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment."

I can assure you that I have never made any such recommendation. I have checked the matter with Admiral Smedberg, who confirms my recollection. In fact, my position has always been that Negroes and whites should be measured by the same standards in open competition. In my own writing, I have deprecated the use of special examinations, and suggested rather that Negroes and other Americans who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities should be given additional instruction and motivation, where possible, at the secondary school level in order to prepare them to compete at the college level.

I should, appreciate it if you would correct the Record on this point.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

ADAM YARMOLINSKY.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE FIFTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the Speaker state what the situation is now with respect to the foreign aid bill?

The SPEAKER. The vote will come up on the next legislative day after the bill is engrossed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the House will meet tomorrow unless unanimous consent is granted to adjourn over until a later day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Would the Speaker permit me to say that there should be no adjournment over tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had no intention in that respect.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the answer of the Speaker to the parliamentary inquiry was clear, but I think as a practical matter it would be in order to state that this means we expect to read the engrossed copy of the bill and vote on the foreign aid bill tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1963, many of our colleagues and I addressed this body on the importance and significance of the fifth Captive Nations Week observance which commenced on July 14 and ended on July 20. With much justification we pointed out then that this fifth observance would exceed all others in scope and depth. We stressed also the point that one of the main themes of the observance would be the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations in this body. As the facts show, these two points have been clearly substantiated.

ADDITIONAL GUBERNATORIAL AND MAYORAL PROCLAMATIONS

About half of the Governors of our States and over three dozen mayors of our large and major cities issued proclamations on the week. In the July 5 issue of the RECORD many of these proclamations appear. At this point I include the following additional proclamations of the fifth Captive Nations Week in the RECORD: Governors of the States of Vermont, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Arizona; Commissioners of the District of Columbia; mayors of Gary, Ind.; Scranton, Pa.; Roanoke, Va.; Portland, Oreg.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Worcester, Mass.; Honolulu, Hawaii; Harrisburg, Pa.; Miami, Fla.; and Youngstown, Ohio.

STATE OF VERMONT PROCLAMATION, PHILIP H. HOFF, GOVERNOR

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a real relaxation of tensions and a genuine peace impossible; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism have resulted in the subjugation of many once-free peoples and created a vast slave empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free nations of the world; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human

freedom for leadership in restoring their freedom, independence, and the enjoyment of the basic human rights; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered Nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged Nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggression and war, a major factor in the balance of power, and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the ominous crisis over Berlin makes it imperative that Americans of all creeds reaffirm their determination to stand by our promises to the people of Berlin and to show that we have not forgotten our silent allies in East-Central Europe; and

Whereas the Soviet colonial rule in East-Central Europe must be condemned as more brutal, exploitative and all-pervasive than the world has ever known; and

Whereas any present or future international agreements with the Soviets are worthless if the Soviet Union refuses to honor its solemn treaties and obligations whereby she has pledged the right of self-determination to the nations now held captive by her: Now, therefore, I, Philip H. Hoff, Governor, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Vermont to join with the other States in observing this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of the oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world, and by other appropriate manifestations.

PHILIP H. HOFF,
Governor.

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF GOV. JOHN DEMPSEY, OF CONNECTICUT

It is important for people who enjoy the blessings of free citizens in a free nation to focus special attention from time to time to the millions who live in oppression and fear as captive peoples in captive nations.

To that end, the week of July 14-20, 1963, will be observed throughout our Nation as Captive Nations Week.

In every captive nation, whether it is Poland, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia in Europe or China, and North Vietnam in Asia, or Cuba close to our own American shores, the need is great for assurance and encouragement from us in their efforts to regain independence and human liberty.

Let us in Connecticut, where freedom has long been ours, reaffirm during this period our steadfast support of the peoples of captive nations in whom the spark and love of liberty is still strong.

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, PROCLAMATION BY GOV. RICHARD HUGHES

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence: Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the week of July

16-22, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New Jersey.

[SEAL]

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

By the Governor:

ROBERT J. BURKHARDT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARIZONA PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas by joint resolution of the National Congress the third week in July of each year is to be designated by proclamation of the President as Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world;" and

Whereas Captive Nations Week provides an occasion for all Americans to show their silent allies, the freedom seeking peoples of the world, that they are not forgotten; and

Whereas many historical and cultural ties exist between the peoples of the captive nations and the people of America: Now, therefore, I, Paul J. Fannin, Governor, do hereby designate and proclaim the week of July 14 through 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in Arizona, and urge the citizens of our State to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies, demonstrating their support of the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom.

[SEAL]

PAUL J. FANNIN,
Governor.

Attest:

WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week Committee has requested the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate the week commencing July 14, 1963, as "Captive Nations Week," to be observed "with appropriate ceremonies and activities"; and

Whereas there is a strong belief that the observance of Captive Nations Week throughout our country and our community will serve the cause of America and the entire free world; that the keeping alive of the spirit of liberation is the West's most effective instrument in the cold war and the chief deterrent to a shooting war; and that it will, in particular, strengthen the hand of the West with respect to the ever-present critical situation facing Berlin; and

Whereas it is deemed appropriate and proper to extend to the peoples of the captive nations the support and sympathy of the people of our community for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence: Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week, and invite the people of the Nation's Capital to participate in the observance of this period by offering prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of the subjugated peoples from the godless tyranny which oppresses them.

WALTER W. TOBRINER,
JOHN A. ISRAELSON,
JOHN B. DUNCAN,

Commissioners of the District of Columbia.
JUNE 20, 1963.

CITY OF GARY, GARY, IND.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress

has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these captive nations; and

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the captive nations have been deprived of their national independence and individual liberties; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a threat to the security of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the captive peoples be kept alive; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to the captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the city of Gary, Ind., share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, John Visclosky, mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the city of Gary to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of Communist-dominated peoples and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and national independence.

JOHN VISCIOSKY,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

CITY OF SCRANTON, PA.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas we Americans are proud that many refugees from the oppressed countries have found asylum in the United States; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to many of the captive nations peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to these people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Scranton are fully aware of, and grieve for, the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of communism: Now, therefore, I, William T. Schmidt, mayor of the city of Scranton, Pa., do hereby designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in the city of Scranton, Pa., and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week.

WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT,
Mayor.

July 15, 1963.

ROANOKE, VA.—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas as a result of Communist aggression and subversion, there now are 2 dozen captive nations; and

Whereas nothing would delight the Communist powers more than a seeming acquiescence on our part toward the permanent captivity of these nations; and

Whereas our Nation is determined to seek the freedom of all the captive nations; and

Whereas there is a need for our people to learn more about the captive nations, and a need for popular cold war education: Now, therefore, to continue to learn and work toward the freeing of all captive nations, the Congress has designated the period of July 14-20, 1963, as the Fifth Captive Nations Week observance, and I, Murray A. Stoller, mayor of the city of Roanoke, Va., do proclaim this period as the Fifth Observance of Captive Nations Week.

Given under my hand this 27th day of June 1963.

MURRAY A. STOLLER,
Mayor.

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas in accordance with Public Law 86-90, the week of July 14-20, 1963, will be observed throughout the country as the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have emphasized the need for our people to learn more about the 2 dozen captive nations in Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that this period be set aside to provide all free people an occasion to show the captive peoples throughout the world that they are not forgotten and that we in the United States consider honor-bound by the wartime and postwar agreements to work ceaselessly and peacefully for the freedom of the people in these countries; and

Whereas this period also presents an occasion to evoke the tribulations of the enslaved peoples within the Soviet Union, including the Russian people themselves who are denied the right of self-determination and basic individual freedoms; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are forever linked by bonds of family and principle to all those who love freedom and justice on every continent, and

Whereas the knowledge that while men remain enslaved in any part of the world, all men are in danger and the desire for liberty and independence by the majority of the people in those submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and are the constant reminders of the need for strong vigilance by all freemen: Now, therefore, I Terry D. Schrunck, mayor of Portland, Oreg., the City of Roses, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14-20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Portland to join with all free Americans in observing this week and reaffirm their determination to work for the ultimate freedom of the oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF FORT WAYNE, IND.

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these captive nations; and

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the captive nations have been deprived of their national independence and individual liberties; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a threat to the security of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the captive peoples be kept alive; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to the captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, Paul M. Burns, mayor of the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week. I invite the people of the city of Fort Wayne to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Communist dominated peoples and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and national independence.

PAUL M. BURNS,
City of Fort Wayne.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Whereas the American Friends of the Captive Nations are dedicated to the peaceful liberation of captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas there are two dozen captive nations in Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba itself; and

Whereas the Soviet Union is dedicated to the concept of captivity of peoples as evidenced by the erection and the presence of the Berlin wall; and

Whereas the United States is pledged to the ideals of freedom and the rights of self-determination of all men and all nations; and

Whereas the United States has a supreme legal and moral obligation to press for the freedom of captive nations by every diplomatic, economic and propaganda means because of its convictions in freedom: Now, therefore, I, Paul V. Mullaney, mayor of the city of Worcester, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and respectfully ask the people of the free world to combine in sincere support of independence for the new nations with the demand for the restoration of independence of the nations in captivity.

PAUL V. MULLANEY,
Mayor of the City of Worcester.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America adopted a resolution in July 1959, providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and that this be done annually until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, is interested in the freedom of other nations; and

Whereas Captive Nations Week again provides an occasion for all Americans to show their silent allies in Europe and in Asia that they are not forgotten: Now, therefore, I, Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, do hereby proclaim the period of July 14-20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge the citizens of Oahu to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

NEAL S. BLAISDELL,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF HARRISBURG, PA.

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the peoples of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 88-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Daniel J. Barry, mayor of the city of Harrisburg, Pa., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 14, 1963, be observed as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Harrisburg to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

DANIEL J. BARRY,
Mayor.

CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.—A RESOLUTION

Whereas the ever-grasping, imperialistic policies of the Communist world have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of national independence in countries in Europe and Asia as well as in Latin America, resulting in a vast empire which threatens the security of the United States and all free people of the world; and

Whereas the people of these submerged and enslaved nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in the constant struggle to restore their spiritual and individual liberties; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has passed a joint resolution and President Kennedy has issued a proclamation designating the week beginning July 14 as Captive Nations Week and asked the people of this country to observe this period with appropriate ceremonies and activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission of the City of Miami, Fla., That the week beginning July 14, 1963, be proclaimed Captive Nations Week in Miami so that the people of Miami may have an opportunity to rededicate themselves to the principles of worldwide freedom and take advantage of every chance to assure the people of these enslaved nations that we share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom, independence and national identity.

Passed and adopted this 3d day of July 1963.

Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration and

the maintenance of peace has become a vital need for all mankind; and

Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas the entire nation has an abiding commitment to the principle of national self-determination and human freedom: Now, therefore, I, Harry N. Svastan, mayor of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14, 1963, Captive Nations Week and urge the citizens of Youngstown to join with the people of the United States of America in observing this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and urge renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

HARRY N. SAVASTEN,
Mayor.

CHIEF REASONS FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

It is evident from these proclamations and the many more that have been issued that popular American interest in the captive nations is not confined to any one section of our country or to just those Americans of East European ancestry. The deep interest in the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. national security is nationwide and across the board. But what is equally revealing and impressive is the widespread national concern for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, one need not go far to understand the basis for this general popular support and the exceedingly favorable response to the proposal among our Members, including many on the Rules Committee itself. Indeed, there are now 40 identical resolutions calling for this special committee. The basis of all this support rests primarily in the reasons underlying the need of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Succinctly, these determining and justifying reasons are as follows:

First. On the issue of war and peace, the moral and political principle of national self-determination is in many respects a weapon far more potent, far more determinative, than missiles, nuclear bombs, or war-equipped space satellites. This overpowering weapon is ours, not Khrushchev's. Through its work a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would steadily expand the arsenal of this weapon for use either in the cold war or in a hot one.

Second. Both Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower have emphasized that the captive nations should be thoroughly and intensively studied for our own security. As a long, overdue response to these calls, what better means could be established than this special committee whose work would productively and profitably open up new dimensions and perspectives in our thinking about all the captive nations.

Third. In his American University address the President called for a re-examination of our views toward the Soviet Union. A special committee would help immensely in such a re-examination by its concentrated investigations into the numerous captive nations in the U.S.S.R. This would be the first time that any congressional committee has adequately explored this major field. Here, too, such an official study is long overdue, and I can assure

you that the constructive work of a special committee would have far-reaching results in terms of our understanding the U.S.S.R. and legislative recommendations.

Fourth. In his 1963 Captive Nations Week Proclamation the President urged the American people "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." Again, by what better means can our people sustain such devotion than through current knowledge and analysis of developments in all the captive nations, which would be a prime task of a special committee manned by the people's own elected representatives.

Fifth. There is a hazardous gap in our official and private facilities as concerns this necessary task of investigating systematically, objectively, and continuously all of the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. Nowhere is there any agency, public or private, performing this essential task. Piecemeal analyses of some captive nations fall desperately short of what is urgently needed for us to assess properly the opportunities we may have to cultivate the strategic value of the captive nations in the cold war, and to legislate accordingly.

Sixth. There are many in our society who would want to play down the captive nations in the illusory hope that Khrushchev would be sufficiently appeased and a detente would be arrived at. There is nothing that Khrushchev would enjoy more than this, for it would mean the virtual extinction of all hope for eventual freedom on the part of the captive peoples. The formation of a special committee would scotch the spread of such an illusion. More, it would be the first concrete implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. The fearful reaction of Moscow to this resolution will never be forgotten. Down to the very present, the Russian totalitarians, with all their missiles, satellites, and arms, have displayed an uncanny fear of the captive nations issue. The reasons for this deep fear would be a paramount object of study by a special committee, leading in turn to specific recommendations whereby we could capitalize on it in the cold war.

Seventh. House Resolution 14 and the other resolutions are realistically based on the aggregate concept of captive nations—meaning those inside the U.S.S.R. as well as those in Asia, Central Europe, and Cuba. This totalistic orientation to the problem, which has yet to be developed, will lead to findings by a special committee which would interrelate developments in the captive world and lay the basis for recommended coordinate action that can tie the interests of different captive nations in our favor.

Eighth. As advocates of freedom everywhere, we must always realize that there is another dimension of the cold war, not just between Moscow's and Peiping's totalitarian empires and the free world but also and essentially between the captive peoples and their quiescent governments. This, too, would be a major object of inquiry by the special

committee which, on the basis of its findings, could make recommendations providing for prudent leverages for the captive nations in their respective cold wars.

Ninth. The enormous power of propaganda has long been a virtual Moscow monopoly. The studies, facts and truths educed by a special committee would give the constant lie to the overblown Russian image, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. One of the chief areas of investigation by the special committee would be the 35 million captive Moslems in the U.S.S.R., a subject which is almost totally overlooked in this country. Aside from the favorable impact that this congressional interest would have on other sectors of the Moslem world, investigations into this area would lead to many concrete proposals pertaining to our informational and possibly propaganda media.

Tenth. A special committee would also for the first time develop and bring into focus the extensive imperio colonial system of Moscow within the U.S.S.R. itself. This, too, is an area that has long been overlooked. The productive and really pioneering work of such a committee would not only provide the basis for new legislative proposals, but also serve our executive branch, our U.N. delegation, our representation in UNESCO and elsewhere.

Eleventh. From all this and more it should be evident that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would have definite legislative intent and purpose. Its extensive studies and investigations, pursued in the manner of the Katyn Massacre Committee and the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression—two outstanding creations of past Congresses—would lead to conclusions that in turn would justify recommendations upon which specific legislative proposals would be founded. Activities ranging from our information programs to economic assistance with regard to the Red totalitarian empire would necessarily come within the purview of the committee's inquiries. Having as its base of inquiry the captive world as a whole, an approach that is unique in itself, the committee would furnish new insights into and critical points for fresh evaluation of our undertakings in relation to the eventual freedom of all the captive nations, covering the diplomatic, economic, cultural, religious, informational, political and many other fields. Even in the field of athletics and the Olympics, telling points can be made.

Twelfth. In reality and function, the existence of a special committee would encroach upon no standing committee. Its unusual orientation toward the captive nations in toto would permit it to dwell on phenomena which have been largely untapped by existing committees.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the chief reasons for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. These are the many reasons why observances of the Fifth Captive Nations Week across the Nation emphasized the outstanding need for such a committee. At this point in

my remarks, I include the following data on these observances in the RECORD:

The July 20 Syracuse Herald-Journal editorial; the Syracuse program; the July 18 and 11 reports in the Catholic Sun; the July 28 and 29 reports in the Pittsburgh Press; the July 29 Pittsburgh Post-Gazette report; the Allegheny County program; the week's listed radio programs in the Pittsburgh papers; the July 11 Pittsburgh Catholic report; the Washington, D.C., program of the week; the Philadelphia program; the New York City festivity; the Buffalo event; and reports on the week in the July 13 Washington Evening Star, July 14 Washington Post, and those in Washington's Catholic Standard.

CITY OF SYRACUSE AND THE COUNTY OF ONONDAGA OFFICIALLY SALUTE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE, JULY 14 THROUGH 21, 1963

INVITATION TO HELP OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The Syracuse-Onondaga Citizens Committee warmly welcomes you to join in the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week from July 14 through 21. As authorized by the Congress in Public Law 86-90, each year the President of the United States issues a proclamation calling upon the American people to remember that more than a third of the world's population still lives under Communist despotism. The 22 nations enumerated in the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" of July 17, 1959, have a total of 906,532,000. This is approximately 35 percent of the population of the world. Therefore, it is fitting that we constantly manifest to such peoples in the captive nations countries that the people of Syracuse-Onondaga share with them aspirations for a speedy recovery of their life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. You, your family and friends are cordially invited to the events prepared by the citizens committee for a community tribute to our allies struggling for freedom, the gallant peoples of the captive nations' countries. This week is hereby dedicated to them.

Calendar of events, 1963

July 8: Hon. John Mulroy, county executive, proclaims Captive Nations Week in Onondaga County and issues a proclamation calling upon fellow citizens to participate in the observance of this week dedicated to the peoples of the world still struggling for their independence.

July 9: Placing of the flags of the captive nation countries for public review will continue daily in the entrance hall of the courthouse of Onondaga County at 401 Montgomery Street in Syracuse, N.Y., until July 19.

July 11: Announcing the beginning of Captive Nations Week, the mayor of the city of Syracuse, the Honorable William F. Walsh, declares July 14 through 21 as official observance week in his proclamation to fellow citizens of our city.

July 14: Syracuse churches announce that special prayers and services will be recited for the clergy and peoples held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

July 15: Throughout the week, there will be a campaign for signatures of all citizens, who support House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations Affairs. Petitions requesting such action will be forwarded to Congressman HOWARD SMITH, chairman, House Rules Committee; Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, author of the resolution; and our Congressman WALTER RIEHLMAN.

July 21: LeMoyne College will host the public rally of the friends and supporters of

Captive Nations Week in its auditorium at 7:30 p.m. Sunday as a climax to the official observances of events held throughout the week. Over 10 nationalities will participate in the artistic presentations, after the reading of the Presidential proclamation, the presentation of colors of the countries held in Communist slavery; and an address by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at LeMoyne College. Presentation to the rally participants of a public resolution appealing to the member states of the United Nations to openly condemn Russian imperialism and exploitation; and ask for a speedy return to the countries enslaved by Moscow of their independence and freedom of self-government.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER

The Soviets, whose spokesmen are fond of calling other people imperialists, now have an empire of no fewer than 23 captive nations. We might add Tibet to the list since its enslavement by Red China.

No fewer than 410 million people are now subject to Communist colonialism.

We know that eventually this empire will crumble as have all others amassed by force of arms. But that is poor consolation to the victims suffering oppression and unhappiness.

We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation.

We have a weapon against communism in recognition and understanding of the plight of those captive peoples. With them we look forward to the day when their enslavement shall come to an end.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14-20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

Given under my hand in the City of New York and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this twentieth day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

CITY OF SYRACUSE, N.Y., OFFICE OF THE MAYOR PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Korea, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and many others; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people of our country in his annual proclamation to observe fittingly Captive Nations Week because it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the people of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a special Resolution No. 14 for establishment of a permanent congressional Committee for Captive Nations Affairs, which we wholeheartedly endorse and request its speedy enactment; and

Whereas it is fitting that we, citizens of the city of Syracuse, clearly manifest to such captive peoples through an appropriate and

official means the historic fact that the people of this community share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their liberties and independence;

Now therefore, I, William F. Walsh, mayor of the city of Syracuse, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in this community, and we urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week as well as in the recognition and study of the plight of the Moscow-dominated nations. Moreover, we urge that our fellow citizens dedicate themselves to support the just aspiration of the peoples striving for liberty and independence.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Syracuse to be affixed.

WILLIAM F. WALSH,
Mayor, City of Syracuse, N.Y.

BISHOP'S OFFICE,
Syracuse, N.Y.

To the Clergy, Religious and Laity of the
Diocese of Syracuse:

The week of July 14-21 has been designated by our President as Captive Nations Week. It has been so designated to make us aware of the plight of the enslaved peoples throughout the world.

While we live our God-given freedoms, we must not forget the many who have been deprived of their basic liberties. The freedom to worship God as one's conscience dictates; the freedom to select representative leaders of one's own choice; the freedom to gather together and form organizations to achieve legitimate goals; the freedom to express one's views; the freedom from unjustly inspired fears and constant threats; these and other inalienable liberties have been harshly curtailed or totally denied to millions by totalitarian governments.

As freedom blessed Americans, I urge the faithful of the diocese to join with their fellow Americans in the civic observances of the Captive Nations Week. As brothers in Christ, I urge them to offer their masses and prayers during this week for the spiritual welfare and long desired liberation of their enslaved brothers.

Devotedly yours in Christ,

WALTER A. FOERY,
Bishop of Syracuse.

SYRACUSE-ONONDAGA CITIZENS COMMITTEE
LEADERS PREPARING 1963 OBSERVANCE OF
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

RED-HELD NATIONS FETED

Members of the Captive Nations Week Committee (CNWC) of Syracuse and Onondaga County planning for Captive Nations Week, July 14-21, were Andres Paap, Estonian Lutheran Church; Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Ukrainian Congress Committee; Arnold V. Golts, Latvian Academic Association; John K. Dungey, American Legion Post 41 and chairman of the CNWC; Stephen Obremski, Polish American Congress; Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at LeMoyne College.

MR. JOHN MULROY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, SIGNS
PROCLAMATION FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
SHOWN OVER LOCAL TV MEDIA

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAIMED THROUGH-
OUT ONONDAGA COUNTY

The Honorable John Mulroy, county executive, issued a declaration proclaiming July 14 through 21 as "Captive Nations Week" and authorized the official presentation of the flags of the captive nations for public review in the Onondaga County Courthouse. Girls in Ukrainian costume were Marusia Pajuk, Irka Budziak, Nadia Pylpyszyn, Marusia Proskurenko, Hania Kuprowsky and Anna Alexandrowych, Arnold V. Golts (Latvian Academic Association); Sarkis Nigolian (Armenian Community Center); Walter D.

Prybyla, Jr. (Ukrainian Congress Committee); John Dungey, chairman of Syracuse-Onondaga Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week; Henry Klimek (Polonez Male Choir); Dr. Alexander Gudziak (Ukrainian Congress Committee); Richard A. Grudzinski (second ward supervisor); Vincent Kasaitis (Lithuanian Association); and Walter Szczepanek (Syracuse Polish Community Home).

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Byeloruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them in the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the peoples of our great country in his annual proclamation to observe fittingly Captive Nations Week, because it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a special Resolution No. 14 for the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee for Captive Nations Affairs, which we wholeheartedly endorse and request its speedy enactment; and

Whereas it is fitting that we, citizens of the County of Onondaga, clearly manifest to such captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the peoples of this community share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their liberties and independence:

Now therefore, I, John H. Mulroy, county executive of Onondaga County, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in this community, and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week as well as in the recognition and study of the plight of the Moscow dominated nations. Moreover, we urge that our fellow citizens dedicate themselves to support the just aspiration of the peoples striving for liberty and independence.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of Onondaga County to be affixed.

JOHN H. MULROY,
County Executive.

Date: July 8, 1963.

PROGRAM CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY, LE MOYNE
COLLEGE, JULY 21

Placing of colors: American Legion, Onondaga County and captive nations colors. Invocation: The Very Reverend Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College. Greetings: The Very Reverend Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College. National anthem: Bernadine Rozycko-Dubiel.

Presentation of Speaker: Stephen M. Obremski, program committee chairman. Address: Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor, Le Moyne College.

Reading of Proclamation: E. Hawley Bendixen, attorney at law.

Introduction of dignitaries.

Presentation of resolution for adoption by assembly.

ARTISTIC PRESENTATIONS

Master of ceremonies, Dr. Mykola Bohatiuk, stage director, Arnold Golts.

1. American Legion chorus, David Kennedy, director. "Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor," Irving Berlin; and "The Creation," Willy Richter.

2. Symphonia Polish Choral Society, "My Nightingale," A. Mickiewicz; "Linden Trees Blossom," K. Wiekomirski; and "Holiday Bells," A. Chlondowski. Sydney Novak, director; Ruth Prybylski, accompanist; Tina Laskowski Sims, president.

3. Folk dances of Latvia, Latvian folk dancers.

4. Lithuanian folk songs (recorded): "My Little Duckling," mixed choir; "O Thou Forest," Women's ensemble; Alfonsas Mikulskis, director, mixed choir; and Atonas Gimzauskas, director, women's ensemble.

5. Armenian choir, Hagop Melkonian, conductor; "My Love—Our Great Language," Mother River Araxe, Anna Markarian, soloist.

6. Hungarian folk tunes, Bella Bartok, composer; Karoly Safran, violinist, with piano accompaniment.

7. Ukrainian male chorus "Surma," Zenon Miahky, conductor, Stephen Rekulak, president; "Harvest," D. Kotko; "White Kerchief," M. Kolesa; "Marichka," S. Sobotazh; and "Our Native Land," V. Tretiak.

8. Estonian folk songs (recorded), Manivald Loite, director; "From the Northern Sun," T. Vettik; "Men, Let's Go Home," G. Ernesaks.

9. Hungarian folk dances, Istvan Babnigg, director; performed by: Olga Nagy and Zoltan Koran.

10. "Polonez" male chorus, Henry V. Strymiski, director; Henry Klimek, president; "With Smoke and Fire," K. Ujejski; also Polish folk songs.

11. Latvian Academic Association, Karlis Zvejnieks, president; "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Accordion solo by Ivars Ozolins.

Concluding remarks: John K. Dungey, committee chairman.

Benediction: Rev. John Sanborn, Syracuse Council of Churches.

"God Bless America," all.

Participating organizations: the Armenian Community Center, the Estonian Lutheran Church, the Hungarian Committee, the Latvian Academic Association, the Latvian American Society, the Polish Community Home, the Polish American Congress, the "Free China" Committee, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Conservative Council, and the American Legion Post 41.

These are captive nations: More than a third of the world's population lives under Communist despotism. The 22 captive nations, as enumerated in the Captive Nations Week resolution of July 17, 1959, have a total of 906,532,000. This is approximately 36 percent of the population of the world. These nations and their populations are:

	In thousands
Albania.....	1,507
Azerbaijan.....	3,300
Armenia.....	1,500
Bulgaria.....	7,793
Byelorussia.....	12,500
China (mainland).....	679,232
Cossackia.....	9,300
Czechoslovakia.....	14,000
Czechs.....	9,000,000
Slovaks.....	5,000,000
East Germany.....	18,800
Estonia.....	1,100
Hungary.....	9,800
Idel-Ural.....	12,000
Latvia.....	1,900
Lithuania.....	3,000
North Korea.....	9,000
North Vietnam.....	18,000

In thousands

Poland.....	29,000
Rumania.....	18,000
Tibet.....	1,300
Turkestan.....	17,000
Ukraine.....	44,500

Total..... 906,532

(Not included in the Captive Nations Week resolution are Croatia, Slovenia, and North Caucasus.)

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary cochairman: Hon. William F. Walsh, mayor of Syracuse; Hon. John Mulroy, county executive of Onondaga.

Chairman, John K. Dungey; Very Rev. Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College; Sarto C. Major, sheriff, Onondaga County; Patrick J. Murphy, chief, Syracuse Police Department; Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor, Le Moyne College; Alfred Cady, Purple Heart Association; George Clow, commander, Onondaga County American Legion; Thomas Higgins, president, Merchants Bank; Garth C. Lax, chairman, Let Freedom Ring; Robert Levertown, commander, Regular Vets; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Quell, Friends; Lt. Col. H. O. Schulze, retired, U.S. Army; Dr. Henry Sliski, physician; Dr. David Kennedy, dental surgeon; Edward Whelan, Schumacher & Whelan.

CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF SYRACUSE AND ONONDAGA COUNTY

Aleksandras Andriusaitis, Istvan Babnigg, E. Hawley Bendixen, Dr. Nicholas G. Bohatiuk, Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Jan Bury, Petrosau Dimitru, Dr. John Dosa, John K. Dungey, Arnold V. Golts, Richard A. Grudzinski, Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Bronislaw Humenny, Dr. Jacob P. Hursky, J. M. Kaweck, Ivan Konstantinoff, Dr. Michael Lohaza, Jan Morrison, Zenon Miahky, Sarkis Ngolian, Stephen M. Obremski, Andres Paap, Dr. Charles Palkert, George Petrov, Walter D. Prybyla, Jr., Rev. S. Roth, S.J., Andrejs Skoroderens, Myron Sydorowych, Harry B. Tellian, Maurice Topalian, Rev. John J. Wang, Gustav Wenczel, and Rev. Leo Wimet.

UKRAINIAN MALE CHORUS "SURMA"

SONGS AND DANCES FROM UKRAINE ARE FEATURED

The "Surma" Ukrainian Male Chorus brings to this community the music of the Ukrainian people. The chorus is directed by Zenon Miahky, 206 Merriman Avenue, Syracuse 4, N.Y. Mr. Stephen Rekulak is the president of the chorus. In the fall of 1956, it was felt that there was a need in the community for a chorus to feature the songs and dances of Ukraine and to keep alive the spirit of freedom and aspiration for independence of the Ukrainian people from Russian Communist domination.

SYMPHONIA POLISH CHORAL SOCIETY

SYMPHONIA CHORAL SOCIETY

Twenty-two years ago, there was formed in this community an all-ladies choir called the Symphonia Choral Society. Its purpose was to promote Polish music, culture and customs in our community. The director is Sidney Novak; the president is Tina Laskowski Simms.

ONONDAGA COUNTY LEGION CHORUS

Under the direction of David Kennedy, the Onondaga County Legion Chorus numbers over 30 voices and enjoys widespread popularity. This chorus is the descendant and the nucleus of a 30-year-old chorus, the old Post 41 chorus directed by Harrie W. Southwick, which has performed all over the country.

ARMENIAN CHOIR

PERPETUATING THE SONGS OF ARMENIA

The newly formed Armenian Choir has over 20 voices under the conductorship of Hagop Melkonian. Syracuse has less than 150 citizens of Armenian heritage, whose cultural and social life revolve about the Armenian Community Center, 372 West Matson Avenue. It was indeed a tremendous accomplishment for the Syracuse Armenians to form and to maintain a choir.

NEW RESOLUTION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HELP ESTABLISH A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS AFFAIRS

If you wish to support House Resolution 14 for the formation of a congressional committee for Captive Nations Affairs, you are encouraged to write a letter or post card expressing your approval to Congressman HOWARD SMITH, chairman, House Rules Committee; Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, author of the resolution; and our Congressman, WALTER RIEHLMAN. Address to House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C. Write immediately. Your vote counts.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Following is the text of a new resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, introduced on January 9, 1963, by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania. A similar resolution (H. Res. 15) was introduced by the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican Congressman from Illinois.)

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances on the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania,

Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the House, of whom not more than 6 shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful process in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its

first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

LATVIAN FOLK DANCERS

Established 10 years ago by students at Syracuse University, the Latvian folk dancers promote the national traditions, dances, and customs of Latvia.

PUBLIC LAW 86-90—PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Adopted by the 86th Congress of the United States of America in July 1959.)

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with

them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

FORWARD IN FREEDOM

The issue of our times is the issue of slavery versus freedom. Freedom can never remain at a standstill. We must either move forward or retreat. To paraphrase the Great Emancipator: The house of humanity divided against itself cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. As believers in the dynamics of freedom, we must move forward.

Support Captive Nations Week.

[From the Catholic Sun, July 18, 1963]

PROGRAM TO HONOR ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS

The annual captive nations program will be held at 7:30 p.m. Sunday, July 21 in the Le Moyne College auditorium.

A three-part program has been planned by the 10 organizations participating in the affair climaxing national Captive Nations Week.

The program is part of this area's salute to the 906,532,000 non-Communists behind the Iron Curtain.

Placing of the captive nations colors will open the program followed by a greeting from the Very Rev. Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president of Le Moyne. Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at Le Moyne, will give the main address.

Readings of city, county, and Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week will follow.

A resolution urging support of the cause of the captive nations will be presented for adoption by the assembly.

Entertainment will be provided by the American Legion chorus, symphonia Polish choral society, Latvian folk dancers, Armenian choir, Hungarian folk singers, and Ukrainian male chorus "Surma," and Polonez male chorus.

[From the Catholic Sun, July 11, 1963]

OFFICIAL

To the Clergy, Religious and Laity of the Diocese of Syracuse:

The week of July 14-21 has been designated by our President as "Captive Nations Week." It has been so designated to make us aware of the plight of the enslaved peoples throughout the world.

While we live our God-given freedoms, we must not forget the many who have been deprived of their basic liberties. The freedom to worship God as one's conscience dictates; the freedom to select representative leaders of one's own choice; the freedom to gather together and form organizations to achieve legitimate goals; the freedom to express one's views; the freedom from unjustly inspired fears and constant threats; these and other inalienable liberties have been harshly curtailed or totally denied to millions by totalitarian governments.

As freedom blessed Americans, I urge the faithful of the diocese to join with their fellow Americans in the civic observances of the Captive Nations Week. As brothers in Christ, I urge them to offer their masses and prayers during this week for the spir-

itual welfare and long-desired liberation of their enslaved brothers.

Devotedly yours in Christ,

WALTER A. FOERY,
Bishop of Syracuse.

PRESIDENT PROCLAIMS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AS OF JULY 14

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy, in proclaiming the week beginning July 14 as Captive Nations Week, has urged Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

The (July 5) proclamation asked that the American people observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. President Kennedy also said in the proclamation: "The cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration * * *. This Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom."

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal, July 20, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON

This is Captive Nations Week, a time of proclamations and observances calling attention to such areas as Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Latvia, Rumania, and Estonia—prisoners in the Iron Curtain dungeon.

The observance was first proclaimed in 1959, after Congress had authorized the President to issue "a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence have been achieved for all in the captive nations of the world."

Sympathy with such desires for the restoration of national dignity and independence, of course, is an integral part of the free world attitude. But Captive Nations Week has become itself a psychological weapon, a torch keeping lighted the fires of discontent in the trapped countries.

In this sense it is more than a sentimental gesture. It is a national declaration that these nations are, in effect, our allies behind the Iron Curtain.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 28, 1963]

PARADE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY

A parade through Kennywood Park will open the delayed observance of Captive Nations Day at 6:45 tonight—weather permitting.

The affair originally was set for 2 weeks ago, but rain forced a postponement.

Principal speaker will be Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and congressional delegate to the 1959 Inter-parliamentary Union Conference in Warsaw.

A Marine Corps color guard will participate in the parade, and representatives of nationality groups will carry portraits of religious leaders symbolic of anti-Communist resistance.

Bishop John J. Wright, of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, will pay tribute to the leaders.

The observance is being arranged by the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County, headed by County Commissioner John E. McGrady.

Folk songs and dances will be performed by Hungarian, Lithuanian, Slovak, Polish and Ukrainian groups.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 29, 1963]

AID RED CAPTIVES, LAWMAKER URGES; CONGRESSMAN'S PLAN TOLD AT KENNYWOOD

A Congressman from Chicago says a Special House Committee on Captive Nations should be created.

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, a Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said such a committee could keep the free world mindful of the Communist denial of civil rights to their captive peoples.

Mr. DERWINSKI addressed the captive nations rally last night at Kennywood Park.

"Captive Nations Week is a practical means of spotlighting the fact that the Soviet Union and its satellite puppets constitute a vast colonial empire," Mr. DERWINSKI said.

He said a strong spirit of nationalism in Communist-held countries is a continuous headache to officials in the Kremlin.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 29, 1963]

HOUSE UNIT ON CAPTIVE AREAS URGED—CONGRESSMAN TELLS RALLY OF NEED TO AID SATELLITES

A Chicago Congressman yesterday stressed need for a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Such a committee could keep the free world mindful of Communist denial of civil rights to their captive peoples, said Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of the 4th District of Illinois.

DERWINSKI, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, addressed the Captive Nations Day rally last night in Kennywood Park.

POINTS TO ACHILLES HEEL

In an interview earlier, he said the annual Captive Nations Week program has gathered increasing attention since it began in 1959.

"Captive Nations Week dramatizes that the captive peoples are the Achilles' heel of the Soviet Union," DERWINSKI said.

He said a strong spirit of nationalism in Communist-held countries is a continuous headache to officials in the Kremlin.

DERWINSKI illustrated by recalling musician Benny Goodman's 1961 visit to Tiflis, capital of the Georgian Republic, Josef Stalin's native land.

"Goodman's normal repertoire included a number of Russian folk songs. At Tiflis, the audience shouted hisses and boos and overturned chairs, demanding that Goodman play Georgian folk songs, not Russian."

RECALLS KHRUSHCHEV BLAST

DERWINSKI said Captive Nations Week has been a source of anger to Communist officials.

He recounted that it was a subject of debate between Nikita Khrushchev and former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon in 1959.

DERWINSKI himself has not escaped the lash of Iron Curtain invective. A Warsaw newspaper editorial accused him of voicing empty slogans of capitalism and branded him a "disgrace to his Polish-born grandmother."

CAPTIVE NATIONS' DAY OBSERVANCE, KENNYWOOD PARK, SUNDAY, JULY 28, 1963, 7 P.M.

Parade through park to stage, 6:45 p.m.: U.S. Marine Corps color guards and nationality groups with portraits of bishops.

Master of ceremonies: Michael Komichak. National anthem.

Pledge of Allegiance: Former Hungarian freedom fighter.

Invocation: Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D.

Welcome remarks and President Kennedy's proclamation: Commissioner John E. McGrady.

Introduction of Bishop Wright: Paul C. Kazimer.

Tribute to persecuted bishops: Most Rev. J. J. Wright, D.D.

Pennsylvania State Senate proclamation. Introduction of honored guests.

Introduction of main speaker: Wence Dolegowski.

Main address: Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois.

Captive Nations Day resolution.

Benediction: Rev. Paul Markowitz.

Folk songs and dances:

Hungarians: United Magyar Civic Association, Mrs. Louis B. Smith.

Lithuanians: St. Casimir's Church, Rev. Walter C. Karaveckas; statement: Rev. Alphonse Susinskas.

Slovaks: The Slovaks of St. Michael's Church, Roman Niznik; statement: Paul C. Kazimer.

Poles: Polish Women's Alliance, Mrs. Dora Alski; statement: Wence Dolegowski.

Ukrainians: Monessen Dancers, Styn Sisters Trio; solo dancers: Yaroslava Polatajko, Michael E. Haritan; statement: Dr. Peter G. Stercho, St. Vincent's College.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 15, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

At 6 p.m.: Captive Nations Week, 1963. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky and Mr. Neil Martin, both of Georgetown University, and Congressman William Bray, of Indiana, discuss the topic: "Russian Frontiers: Moscow to Khrushchev", WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 16, 1963]

HIGHLIGHTS ON RADIO

At 6 p.m.: (WPIT AM-FM) "Captive Nations Week, 1963." Dr. Howard E. Kershner, of the Christian Freedom Foundation, talks about our foreign policy with respect to communism.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 17, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

At 6 p.m.: Captive Nations Week—1963. A discussion on "Why Captive Nations Week," WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 18, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

6 p.m. (WPIT AM-FM)—Captive Nations Week, 1963. Dick Morphew, of the Citizens Council Forum, interviews Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and Congressman ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama, on the Cuban situation.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 19, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

6 p.m., Captive Nations Week, 1963. Michael Komichak, secretary of the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County, talks about the need of establishing a special House committee. WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Catholic, July 11, 1963]

CIVIC PROGRAM TO SALUTE CAPTIVE PEOPLE

Captive Nations Week will begin here Sunday, July 14, with a civic program at Kennywood Park starting at 5 p.m.

It is one of many observances throughout the United States to remind Americans of the plight of European and Asian nations ruled by communism.

The third week of July was established for this purpose by a congressional resolution in 1959.

Principal speaker at the Kennywood program will be Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois. The invocation will be given by Bishop Wright and the benediction by Rev. Paul Markowitz of the First Hungarian Church. Master of ceremonies will be Michael Komichak of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Nationality groups of the captive nations will parade through the park before the speaking program.

WASHINGTON CAPTIVE NATIONS

WEEK COMMITTEE,

Washington, D.C., July 11, 1963.

DEAR SIR: Captive Nations Week, July 14 through 20, is designated by Congress each year as a time for Americans of all national backgrounds and creeds to express united support for the just aspirations of people in Communist-ruled lands for freedom and self-determination.

On Sunday, July 21, starting at 2 p.m., wreath-laying ceremonies will be held in Lafayette Park and concluded by a dedication rally at the Washington Monument grounds. These acts are to remind Americans of those who left their homelands to aid our forefathers in the struggle for America's freedom and independence.

Your organization, because of its dedication to the causes of freedom, is needed to participate actively with other patriots in this solemn observance.

For your convenience we have enclosed a program schedule and a map of the dedication area. For further details and coordination, please call 296-4870. We would also appreciate an indication of the total number of persons who will attend from your group. Thank you.

Respectfully,

DONALD L. MILLER.

COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1963

PROGRAM

2 p.m., all participants meet at Lafayette Park.

2-2:10, invocation.

2:10-2:20, memorial address.

2:20-2:30, laying of wreath at Kosciuszko statue.

2:30-2:40, laying of wreath at Von Steuben statue.

2:40-3:15, group will proceed to Sylvan Theater on Washington Monument grounds. Transportation will be provided as needed.

3:15-4:15, commemorative address by Congressman EDWARD DERWINSKI.

Special program.

Benediction.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Participants from nationality groups are invited to bring national flags, dress in native costume, and carry any national display as appropriate.

OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK,

July 14-21, 1963

President John F. Kennedy: I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, invite the people of the United States of America to observe the Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Why Captive Nations Week?

To preserve freedom in the United States of America.

To promote freedom in the enslaved world.

To make all aware of those who lack freedom.

To give hope to those who aspire to freedom.

These are the captive nations: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Mainland China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, and White Ruthenia.

To believe that we may preserve our freedom while these nations remain enslaved is foolish and suicidal indeed. Each and every American must understand and take part in the battle to keep man a free and inde-

pendent being under God. The battle is here and overseas; within our boundaries in education and material assistance; overseas in the giving of hope and eventual aid. For now, every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice.

For the past few years Moscow has reaped cold war successes because the West allowed itself to be confused, divided and deceived by Russian propaganda, basically to the effect that unless the West accepts Khrushchev's terms of "peaceful coexistence" the alternative is total destruction by atomic warfare. This, of course, is the perennial bluff and bluster of Khrushchev, his method, which unfortunately has been very effective.

The Soviet Union presents on the outside a formidable and cohesive front. However, all is not well. All persecutions, deportations, breaking up and rotation of families, brainwashing and strict censorship has been incapable of stilling the ever-present, innate desire for freedom and independence. The curtain opens now and then and the truth flashes through.

Entire nations are enslaved and suffering under the heavy yoke of Russian communism. Since 1917 this control for the minds and bodies of men has been waged by the Reds. Unbelievable slaughters in Hungary, Ukraine, Poland, China, and elsewhere have been the rule, not the exception. Their sufferings are beyond comprehension. Commonsense justice demands that we preface any request for peaceful coexistence with consideration of the plight of these captive nations.

The main hope for freedom and independence for these nations rests with us.

We must never forget what is happening and never cease efforts to work toward its eventual end.

When we turn our backs on the captive nations we decide to allow the suffering of victims today and of yet-unborn millions tomorrow.

It is for this reason we celebrate Captive Nations Week. We must remind ourselves constantly that our freedom is insecure while others are enslaved. We, individually and through our representatives, must do everything possible in the cause of freedom. To fail in this duty, we will not only condemn these people to their fate, but we will condemn ourselves to a final surrender of our freedom by default.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14-20, 1963

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week our organizations will sponsor, in New York, the following events:

1. On Sunday, July 14, at 10 a.m., a solemn mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Francis Cardinal Spellman will preside. Rev. Robert Moher will preach the sermon. National groups, with flags, are requested to assemble at 9:30 a.m. on the west side of Fifth Avenue opposite the cathedral.

2. On Sunday, July 14, at 11 a.m., a commemorative service at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, Cathedral Heights. Rev. Canon Harold Landon will conduct the service and preach.

3. On Sunday, July 14, at 12:30 p.m., at ACEN House, 769 First Avenue, across the street from the United Nations, flag-raising ceremony of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Speakers: Representative William G. Bray from Indiana; Mr. Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

4. On Monday, July 15, at 12 noon, in front of City Hall, Captive Nations Week ceremony. Mayor Robert F. Wagner will be the principal speaker.

Each of these functions provides an appropriate occasion to manifest support of the freedom aspirations of the captive na-

tions. In the face of prevailing trends of accommodation with the Communist regimes, such demonstrations have never been more necessary.

You are cordially invited to attend, in national garb if possible. Bring along your flags and banners. Advise your friends and relatives and exhort them to come.

Msgr. John Balkunas, Chairman, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; Thomas J. Cuite, Member, Captive Nations Week Committee; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations; Christopher Emmet, Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Stephen J. Jarema, Chairman, American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

PROGRAM OF EVENTS—THE CITY OF BUFFALO OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14 THROUGH 21, 1963

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary Chairman: Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

Chairman: Nestor Procyk, M.D., assistant director, West Seneca State School.

Executive assistant: John J. Sullivan, secretary to the Mayor.

Special assistants: John A. Boccio, budget division, city of Buffalo; Robert E. Casey, deputy corporation counsel, city of Buffalo; Francis X. Schwab, division of planning, city of Buffalo.

Cochairmen: Henry J. Osinski, president, Central Council of Polish Organizations; Dr. John M. Juhasz, Actio Hungarica; A. O'Neil Kline, Kiwanis Club of Buffalo.

Grand marshal: Arthur J. Vater, senior vice commander, Department of New York State, VFW.

Secretary: Dr. Stephen Gredelj, Croatian Organizations.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Herman G. Achtziger, commander, Erie County Council, VFW.

Angel Bezeff, Macedonian Patriotic Organization.

Andrew Diakun, Erie County Bar Association.

Vasil Dincev, Bulgarian National Front.

Hon. Howard E. Finney, commissioner of police.

Hon. Chester C. Gorski, president, Common Council.

Hon. Albert C. Killian, commissioner of parks.

Francis M. Kindel, past president, United Anti-Communist Action Committee.

Daniel H. Kurdziel, commander, Erie County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans.

Jerome R. Lombardo, commander Erie County Committee, American Legion.

Mychajlo Lysak, vice chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Walter L. Mikulski, Americanism chairman, Erie County Council, VFW.

Felix Mindy, Polish Organizations.

Dr. Christo Mladenov, Bulgarian Organizations.

Marian Morozevych, Ukrainian Liberation Front Organizations.

Shehat Osmani, Albanian Groups.

Jacob Ozolins, Latvian Club.

Clemet Sakas, Lithuanian Club.

Jivko Shumenoff, Macedonian Organizations.

Kalev Susi, Estonian Club.

Joseph Taylor, chairman, Committee of Hungarian Churches and Societies of Greater Buffalo.

B. John Tutuska, sheriff, Erie County.

John E. Whitmer, office of the mayor, city of Buffalo.

Hon. Robert J. Zahm, commissioner of fire. Ragib Zukic, Croatian Organizations.

MESSAGE FROM THE MAYOR

When our forefathers envisioned the founding of our great Nation they were motivated by great ideals and hoped for a peaceful world in which justice would govern the future of all nations and mankind. Their foresight, sacrifice, hard work, perseverance, and heroism brought forth a nation, which, although young, as history is measured, is second to none in the guarantees of freedom, individual liberty, and the right of family happiness. The labors of the Founding Fathers, their deep philosophy set forth in the documents of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution form a monumental asset in the annals of Western civilization.

Since the founding years, the United States has guarded these inalienable rights for our people and all others. The United States has opened her heart and gates to the teeming masses of the persecuted and unwanted of other lands granting them a chance to a dignified life as guaranteed by the laws of our land. America has always been a staunch defender of human rights making heavy sacrifices in human life to preserve in other far off lands those same rights which are the cornerstone of our great United States. Many of America's sons and daughters have made the supreme sacrifice in distant lands. Those sacrifices were made because we know that a world half free and half slave cannot survive.

Notwithstanding these great sacrifices the world again is confronted with a mortal challenge. A highly organized tyranny, void of any signs of morals and human dignity looms threateningly on the horizon. America is leading the family of nations in a total and deadly encounter with this menace. The Soviet Union this vast prison of nations, is now endangering our very existence.

The desire and fervent aspirations of the peoples in the Captive Nations for freedom and national independence provides a powerful third force in the war launched by imperial Russia. This third force is bound to our political conviction by an unbreakable bond of ideals—just as it stands as a formidable and unyielding enemy of imperial Russia. We must learn to use this powerful third force for peace, for justice among nations, and for a new world order based upon universal freedom and social righteousness.

The week of July 14 through 21, 1963, is set aside by an Act of Congress and by Presidential proclamation as Captive Nations Week. Through this weeklong observance we are reminded of the blessings which we enjoy as a free people and the commitment of our Nation, under God, to advance the frontiers of freedom until tyranny and despotism have vanished from the earth.

As mayor of Buffalo I welcome this opportunity to advance the cause of peace with justice and I urge and invite all my fellow citizens to join in the activities arranged for this annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor of Buffalo.

HIGHLIGHTS OF EVENTS

Sunday, July 14, a.m.: Religious observances and prayers in churches of the city of Buffalo.

At 1 p.m.: Marching groups and motorcade forming at Main and Tupper Streets to proceed to the City Hall.

At 2:30 p.m.: Civic opening of Captive Nations Week program at McKinley Monument in front of City Hall; presentation of colors; National Anthem; invocation by Rev. Porter W. Phillips, secretary, Council of Churches; posting of captive nations flags; welcome by Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman; proclamation of Captive Nations Week by Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo; address by Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of Congress,

41st District of New York; vocal presentation; benediction by Msgr. Stanley A. Kulinski, director, Diocesan Labor College.

Wednesday, July 17, 12 noon: Civic luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo, Hotel Statler Hilton, Terrace Room. Speaker: Hon. Charles J. Kersten, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman, Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. Topic: "Liberation of the Captive Nations—Key to Peace with Justice." Tickets \$2.75 (for reservations call TL 2-3399).

Sunday, July 21, 7:30 p.m.: Captive Nations Festival, Delaware Park at Albright-Knox Art Gallery; Buffalo Civic Orchestra under the direction of Jan Wolanek; a pageant of songs and dances of the captive nations; speaker: Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

All events are open to the public. No admission charge will be made except for the civic luncheon on Wednesday, July 17, at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 13, 1963]

FREEDING CAPTIVE NATIONS CALLED REALISTIC AIM

The liberation of the captive satellite nations remains a realistic objective, Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, said in a message read at a breakfast meeting today.

The fifth annual Washington Metropolitan area observance of Captive Nations Week began with a meeting at the Market Inn. The observance will feature special prayers and church services tomorrow, a banquet Wednesday, and a wreath-laying ceremony at the Washington Monument on July 21.

"The sad fact is that since Captive Nations Week was first proclaimed * * * the island of Cuba has gone Communist, the northern portion of Laos has been taken over, South Vietnam is again fighting for its life, a solidly pro-Soviet government has been established in China, a government under control of known Communists has been elected and still remains in power in British Guiana and a dozen countries in Latin America are in mortal jeopardy," Senator Dodd said in the paper read by David Martin, his special assistant.

"I believe, now that our thermonuclear deterrent has been counterbalanced by a Soviet thermonuclear deterrent, it becomes more important than ever to sustain and encourage the resistance movement in the captive nations," Senator Dodd said.

He added that the captive peoples' will to resist "remains the surest deterrent to Soviet aggression."

The captive nations (problem) should be raised at every international conference and at every United Nations session, Senator Dodd said, in order that the nations will know the West has not deserted them.

Representative BARRY, Republican, of New York, said the descendants of immigrants from the captive nations "will never be reconciled to the captivity of the land of their ancestors." He warned that any quick action to release the nations would add to their burdens.

"Any outside armed intervention would undoubtedly provoke an all-out global war * * * and hence, it is unthinkable," Mr. BARRY said. "Likewise, any internal uprising * * * such as that which occurred in Hungary in 1956 * * * would undoubtedly be crushed by Soviet tanks and troops with a great amount of bloodshed and death."

America's ideal of individual liberty must continue to be "the shaft of light that breaks through the darkness of the Iron Curtain," he said.

Representative MARSH, Democrat, of Virginia, told the breakfast meeting that "Woodrow Wilson, great internationalist though he was, would not have looked with

favor on current State Department suggestions that the United States move toward full diplomatic interchange with the Kadar regime which the Soviets impressed on captive Hungary."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 14, 1963]

DODD URGES UNITED STATES SUPPORT OF ANTI-REDS

The possible defection of 100 Soviet satellite military divisions was predicted by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, yesterday.

With the present nuclear stand-off between the United States and Russia, Dodd said there is an increased chance for a non-nuclear war in which such a defection would be crucial.

The active encouragement by the United States of the resistance movement in Communist captive countries is necessary, according to Dodd, if the chance for such a defection is to remain.

Dodd's speech, read by Special Assistant David Martin at a breakfast launching Washington's Captive Nations Week observance, attacked what it called the defeatism responsible for U.S. inaction during the Hungarian revolt and the lackadaisical support of the Cuban freedom fighters at the Bays of Pigs.

He also accused the United Nations of allowing its debates on self-determinism to be dominated by discussions of Western colonialism in Africa and Asia. The U.N. should face the issue of Soviet colonialism in Europe, he said.

The breakfast meeting was also addressed by Congressmen John O. Marsh, Jr., Democrat of Virginia, and Robert R. Barry, Republican of New York, and Peter P. Lejins, president of the American Latvian Association.

The Captive Nations Week observance, which will feature a special church service today, was established by Congress in 1959 to express support for the aspirations of captive people for freedom from Communist tyranny.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, July 12, 1963]

REPARATION SOCIETY PRAYS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Reparation Society of the Immaculate Heart of Mary will attend an all-night vigil at St. Ignatius Church, Baltimore, next Friday. This month's vigil has been arranged to coincide with the observance of Captive Nations Week. A chartered bus will leave Washington at 8 p.m. and return at 7 a.m. Saturday. Round trip fare is \$3. For information and reservations contact Virginia Murphy, 1000 Perry Street NE. (526-9125).

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, July 5, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCES PLANNED

Captive Nations Week will be observed in the metropolitan area beginning Saturday, July 13. The week's observance will feature a breakfast, special prayers, church services, a banquet, and will conclude with a wreath-laying ceremony Sunday, July 21, at the Washington monuments of heroes of the various nations now held captive by Communists. Americans of all national backgrounds and creeds are urged to express their united support for the just aspirations of captive people from Communist tyranny. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of the faculty of Georgetown University is chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

EARLY ACTION ON RESOLUTIONS

Forty resolutions calling for a special committee are pending before the Rules

Committee. Action on these resolutions is long overdue. Many of our Members on Rules are on record in favor of the establishment of this necessary committee. In view of the general support demonstrated for this committee, along with numerous colleagues I urge that early action be taken on this vital measure. If, as General Taylor and many others feel, there is the fear that euphoria might overtake us following the ratification of the test ban treaty, I know of no more sobering activity than a patient, well-planned, and methodic study of all the captive nations with the primary view of formulating legislation contributing to our strength and posture in the cold war.

A special committee would also be the formidable symbol of America's determination to maintain and preserve the hopes of all the captive peoples for eventual freedom and independence. It would give concrete expression to the will of countless Americans who in the Fifth Captive Nations Week observance displayed this spirited determination. As indications of this, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following comments on the week be appended to my remarks:

The July 17 New York Journal-American editorial; the July 15 New York Times report and July 13 Journal-American report; the July 15 Daily News report; an Indianapolis News editorial; the July 12 Virginia Register report; a manifesto for the week; a July 12 Catholic Standard editorial; a July 15 column in the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times Leader; a July 27 Daily News editorial; two statements of the National Captive Nations Committee; a concise comparative statement on the captive and free worlds issued by the Washington Captive Nations Committee, and, finally, a copy of House Resolution 14.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 17, 1963]

THE CAPTIVES

This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

It serves to remind us that:

1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a non-aggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime—that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

Further, as "Editor's Report" by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. "The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action."

We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 15, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK UNDERWAY

The observance of Captive Nations Week began here yesterday with church services and a ceremony in United Nations Plaza.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, told a group of 150 persons outside the headquarters of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, 769 United Nations Plaza, that free elections in the captive nations must be a condition of discussions between members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Communist bloc.

Earlier about 50 expatriates, many of them dressed in folk costumes and carrying flags, attended the 10 a.m., solemn mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral. They were received by Cardinal Spellman and they heard a statement of the cardinal read by Rev. Robert Moher, a professor of the Catholic University of America in Washington.

The observance will continue here today with a ceremony on the steps of city hall with Mayor Wagner as the main speaker. It is sponsored by the American Friends of the Captive Nations, the Conference of Americans of Central European Descent and the assembly.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 13, 1963]

CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS WEEK OPENS

The observance of Captive Nations Week will officially open tomorrow with the celebration of a solemn mass at 10 a.m. in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Fifth Avenue at 50th Street.

Representatives of captive European nations will attend the mass. Preacher will be Rev. Robert Moher, C.S.C., who is assisting on the staff of the cathedral. He is former professor of moral theology at Holy Cross Seminary, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

[From the New York Daily News, July 15, 1963]

RED CAPTIVES VOTING ASKED

Free elections in communism's captive nations of Europe were demanded yesterday as a condition for any nonaggression-pact negotiations between NATO and the Communist bloc.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, made the demand at a ceremony marking the start of the fifth annual Captive Nations Week. The program, outside the office of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, opposite U.N. headquarters, was attended by 150 persons.

Representative JOSEPH P. ADDABO, Democrat-Liberal, of Queens, voiced a hope that the U.N. "will give the captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—the opportunity for self-determination."

Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman of the Assembly of Captive Nations, urged the U.N. to fight "flourishing Soviet colonialism" as vigorously as it has "the now almost-vanished Western-type colonialism."

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 25, 1963]

FREE THE CAPTIVES

Although it has been roundly condemned for "doing nothing," the State legislature has produced one positive action which should win the praise of Hoosiers of both parties.

The general assembly has passed, and Governor Welsh has signed, a concurrent resolution declaring the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" in Indiana.

The resolution commemorates the solidarity of the American people with the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union, and declares

American dedication to the proposition that they shall once more be free.

As passed in the legislature, the resolve incorporates the text of a similar resolution passed in 1959 by the U.S. Congress. The wording of this latter declaration fittingly sums up the purpose of Captive Nations Week:

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist and other religious freedom, and of their individual liberties;

"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive;

"The desire for liberty and independence of the overwhelming majority of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace;

"It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

To make this fact clear, the Governor is memorialized by the legislature "to do all things necessary" in observing Captive Nations Week in Indiana, beginning this July.

This occasion was marked last year by a series of impressive ceremonies and observances, headed up by Col. Roscoe Turner and then-Mayor Charles Boswell.

We trust this year will be distinguished by similar ceremonies, and we congratulate the legislature and the Governor for putting official sanction behind so worthy a cause.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

HONOR CAPTIVE NATIONS—PUBLIC LAW 86-90 PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN JULY 1959

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the peoples of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China,

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

COPIES OF BOOKLET ARE AVAILABLE

Copies of the booklet "Flags of the Captive Nations," by Robert E. Ramsey are still available and may be purchased by writing to the author care of the West Virginia Register, Post Office Box 230, Wheeling, W. Va. Copies are priced at 25 cents each.

The booklet gives a résumé of an event that took place in Denver, Colo., in September, 1961, which honored the captive nations. It also contains a copy of Public Law 86-90, which calls for the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week."

The law was the outgrowth of a resolution that was principally the work of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Inc., Washington, D.C.

MANIFESTO FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1963

The undersigned organizations dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July of each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

All the captive peoples of Europe and Asia, including the bulk of the Russian and Chinese peoples themselves, have been enslaved for long years by Communist tyranny. The Soviet Union not only preserved all the colonial conquests of Czarist Russia, but expanded the empire further. Since World War II, the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe have been deprived of their national independence, in disregard of solemn treaties and agreements. Since 1921 several non-Russian nations, which became independent following the collapse of the Czarist empire, had their independence forcibly suppressed, while all other non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union have since 1919 been denied their promised right to national self-determination. All have lost

their basic human freedoms—freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and what is perhaps most important of all, freedom from fear.

The captive peoples of Central and Eastern Europe have never ceased to resist actively when the opportunity presented itself, passively when necessity dictated. Even after both the United Nations and the Western Powers failed to come to the aid of the Hungarian revolution, they did not cease to hope; and their more recent disappointment at the unopposed erection of the Berlin wall has still not caused them to abandon hope. But this hope—which alone feeds the embers of resistance—depends on two major factors: The resolve with which the free world responds to Soviet threats, whether military or political, whether in Europe, Asia or Latin America; and the clarity and steadfastness with which the Western Powers—and the United States above all—commit themselves and pursue the goal of freedom for the captive nations.

Despite formal assurances that U.S. policy continues to support the aspirations of freedom of the captive peoples, there are strong indications that this policy is, in fact, evolving toward accommodation with the Communist governments. This is illustrated by the U.S. abstention on the crucial vote in the United Nations Credentials Committee on the approval of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

It is claimed by the supporters of a new approach that expanded relations with the Communist regimes will induce them to follow a course of greater independence toward Moscow and to grant some freedoms to their subjects. But this overlooks the basic fact that all improvements in the lot of the captive peoples have invariably been the result of pressures on the Communists, both from within and without. If the people of Hungary and Poland are better off than their neighbors in eastern Europe, it is because the freedom fighters of Hungary challenged the Soviet might with their bare hands—and because the Soviet Union, fearful that the revolution might spread to Poland, agreed in panic to the policy of relaxation. The gradual improvement in the lot of the Hungarians since the black repressions of 1956 and 1957 is partly due to the constant pressure exerted by the United Nations to secure compliance with its resolutions, and to the United States' hitherto steadfast refusal to recognize the legitimacy of a government forced on the Hungarian people by Soviet tanks. It is also partly a function of economic necessity; for without concessions the Communists could not secure the cooperation of the workers and technicians.

We are fearful that a policy of accommodation will have disastrous results not only for the captive peoples themselves, but for the whole free world. The resistance of the captive peoples, which has long been a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggression, might be weakened to the point where it would cease to be a factor in the calculations of the Kremlin. This would leave the Kremlin free to undertake further adventures against a West already noticeably weakened by the Communist gains in the recent Italian elections, and by dissensions in NATO. It will also challenge the credibility of American firmness not only in Europe, but in the Caribbean. It will nullify the effects of the American administration's firm stand, last fall, on the Russian missile bases in Cuba.

We call upon the U.S. Government not to embark on a course of accommodation with the Communist dictatorships. Only by leading the fight for freedom of oppressed peoples everywhere can the West assume the spiritual and diplomatic offensive in the world-wide struggle for liberty and justice. Only thus can the West effectively counter both the Soviet strategy of expansion by

economic, political and military pressure, and the danger of nuclear war.

In commemorating Captive Nations Week:

We accuse the U.S.S.R. Government of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania;

We further accuse the Soviet Government of forcibly depriving the peoples within its own borders of the promised right of self-determination and of destroying the formerly free and independent states of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Byelorussia, and others;

We urge that the Hungarian question be retained on the United Nations agenda until the U.N. resolutions on Hungary have been complied with.

We urge the governments of the United States and its allies:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, their support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist imperial system and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations.

2. To recognize that any relaxation of tensions can only follow, not precede, the realization of self-determination through free elections in these captive nations; that there can be no end to the Cold War as long as an Iron Curtain runs through Europe and half of Europe remains enslaved, and that the strict observance of the right of self-determination must be made the precondition in any security agreements.

3. To be always mindful of the proven fact that the Soviet Union and the satellite regimes desperately need as much of the Western economic strength as they can draw from trading with the West, and accordingly, to use the tremendous bargaining power their economic strength confers upon them to exact meaningful political concessions for the captive peoples and for the entire free world.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 14-20, 1963, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet-subjugated lands in the world-wide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help them in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Christopher Emmet, Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations; Msgr. John Balkunas, Chairman, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; Thomas Cuite, National Captive Nations Committee; Steven J. Jarema, Chairman, American Conference for the Liberation of the U.S.S.R. Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

[From the Catholic Standard, July 12, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

A thoughtful observance of Captive Nations Week is good insurance against captivity. Although we welcome every whiff and vestige of evidence that Russian communism is turning toward the West, we must very soberly gage both the validity of these indications and our course. The plight of the captive nations is the best example for our guidance.

People must live on facts, not promises. People must enjoy the daily benefits of freedom—not party explanations of "group freedom"—before they can say they are free.

Therefore the gage of what the Reds mean about human rights, including freedom, is what they are actually doing in the captive countries.

By any standard of civilized law and usage, the captive countries well deserve their name. The very foundation of human rights is not acknowledged, that men as creatures of God possess rights granted by the Creator. The state in the captive countries assumes the rights of God and man, presuming to parcel them out according to their desires. Even the reports that governments in these states have now relaxed their controls, granting some scant exercise of rights, confirms the inadmissible premise that the state, not the individual, possesses the rights.

The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, July 15, 1963]

SELLOUT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS LIKELY

This is Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed, perhaps with some embarrassment, by President Kennedy—and it comes, truly, at a strange conjunction of the stars.

On the one hand, the sponsors of the week, the insistently active National Captive Nations Committee, with Herbert Hoover as its Honorary Chairman and the fire-breathing Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University as its working head, is busy deploring our "many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later."

"Beyond all rationality," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a breather to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

While Dr. Dobriansky speaks with an iron voice, however, the administration obviously hopes that Khrushchev, with Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman waiting on his doorstep, will not take any of this "strum and drang" stuff on the part of the Captive Nations Committee too seriously.

It is not that anybody contemplates a conscious sellout of eastern European hopes in exchange for a nuclear test ban pact with the Soviets. The idea of an opening to the east, which was first explored by the Vatican, is something that is conceived in expectations of a quid for a quo.

The theory behind it all is that Soviet Russia has actually been undergoing a mutation, or a sea-change, and is ready to ease up on the Captive Nations. The "things that are God's" in Poland and Hungary, so the hopes run, will be freed from secular or political interference; the churches will be allowed to preach and practice Christianity without hindrance; and some measures of civil liberty might be expected to follow in an atmosphere that is purged of religious tensions.

When this columnist put the foregoing case for the "Opening to the East" to organizers of Captive Nations Week, however, he got a short answer: "Crumbs." He also got a prediction that the Kennedy administration, for all the hopes that Averell Harriman may carry with him to Moscow, will not dare settle for crumbs.

KHRUSHCHEV'S DEAL

Khrushchev is already on record as being willing to accept a test ban agreement that would cover nuclear explosions in the air or underwater provided the NATO nations are

ready to sign a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its East European allies. But the trade of pact for pact, short of including along with it a Soviet guarantee of free elections in the East European satellites, will almost certainly never be made.

For one thing, a pact is a treaty, and all treaties to which the United States is a signatory must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate under the "advise and consent" clause of the Constitution. It is impossible to visualize two-thirds of the Senate signing away the hopes of the East European captive peoples, or granting what would amount to recognition of the long-term legitimacy of the East German Communist State.

If you don't believe that the Senate would put its collective foot down on a treaty that would consign Eastern Europe to the Soviets in perpetuity, just take a look at the list of honorary members of the National Captive Nations Committee. The list includes Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, KEATING and JAVITS, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, THURSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. A bipartisan list that crosses all lines, whether of party or ideology.

Moreover, there is more than idealism involved. A SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, has a Polish and Hungarian vote to worry about; a LAUSCHE, with much of his strength in Cleveland, Ohio, has all the bloods of Eastern Europe watching him. In Connecticut, Senator THOMAS DODD cannot live politically without support from people with Polish ties.

There is one way around the U.S. Senate; an exchange of "declarations" on the part of the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact stooges would not have to run any Constitutional gauntlet, for it would not have the force of a treaty. But one cannot conceive of such a "declaration" passing muster with the West Germans or with De Gaulle.

The worries about a "sellout" this week, then, are not very real, even if Averell Harriman might be complaisant, which is extremely doubtful, anyway.

[From the New York Daily News,
July 27, 1963]

SOME TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

"Now that we have banned nuclear tests," bawled N. S. Khrushchev yesterday at a Kremlin gabfest with W. Averell Harriman, "let us move forward in the direction of easing international tensions and the liquidation of the cold war."

This was just after Khrushchev and the U.S. test ban negotiator had exchanged happy hugs over Thursday's initialing of the piece of paper that may eventually outlaw some nuclear weapons tests.

Old huggy-thuggy Khrushchev led off the above-quoted remark with a typical lie. We have not "banned nuclear tests."

The proposed partial ban treaty has only been initialed. It has not been signed, and the U.S. Senate has yet to give it the once-over—preferably the thrice-over. France and Red China are refusing to take part in it, and a big Chinese Red named Kuo Mo-jo bragged only yesterday that his country will have nuclear weapons "in the not too distant future."

Yet Khrushchev is already trying to rush the Western Allies into far-ranging discussions of various pet projects of his. Chief among these is a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations. That would mean recognition of Communist East Germany, an end to any hope of German unification, and abandonment by the Western Allies of all of Khrushchev's captive nations.

The obvious move for our side is to grab the ball and suggest—with vigah—some topics of its own for discussion with the Kremlin hugger-mugger.

Why not demand that he talk about pulling his troops out of Cuba, calling off his dogs in Laos, Venezuela, Brazil, and Guatemala; holding free, secret ballot elections in all the captive nations; and giving the Western Allies free and unhindered use of ground routes between West Germany and Berlin?

Thursday's initialing of the test ban treaty does indeed offer a chance for some fruitful discussions, as Mr. Harriman says. But has our side the guts to grab that chance for its own advantage; or will it, as for years past, let the Red Hitler choose the subjects for discussion and dominate the conversation?

"LIBERATE CUBA, RESTORE FAITH IN ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS, WIN COLD WAR," 1963 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK THEME

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 9, 1963.—In a statement to all Members of the Congress, the National Captive Nations Committee announced today the theme of the 1963 Captive Nations Week: "Liberate Cuba, restore the faith in all captive nations, win the cold war." Following up the President's proclamation of the week last Friday, the committee's chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, declared, "Cuba, the latest in the roster of captive nations, can be liberated if we revive the Kersten amendment to the past mutual Security Acts and apply it thoroughly to Cuba." Originally designed for the Eurasian captive nations, the amendment provided for the formation of military-equipped Freedom Corps in the fifties.

The statement called attention to the fact that "the nationalism reflected in the party rivalries throughout the empire is the prime result of a whole decade of captive nations' opposition to Moscow's imperio-colonial rule, in Poland as well as Georgia, in Rumania as well as Ukraine, in Red China as well as Turkestan." Dr. Dobriansky, who is also a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and the author of the Captive Nations Week resolution, emphasized:

"We are today committing many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later, but beyond all rationality is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a 'breather' to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

In addition to action on Cuba, the committee proposed the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in Congress, the passage of the Freedom Commission and Academy bill, and a full-scale debate in the United Nations on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, within the U.S.S.R. and without.

It also called upon Congress to put into effect the President's recent suggestion for a re-examination of our views toward the U.S.S.R. by opening up "for public discussion the captivity of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R." NCNC, which guides the annual Captive Nations Week observances, concluded on this note: "Our failure to at least start with these few proposals would justify raising the question, 'Who will be next on the long list of captive nations?'"

Referring to his telegram to the President on July 6, Dr. Dobriansky again praised the President for his early proclamation and his stress on "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty," including the majority of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself.

CAPTIVE NATIONS SPONSORS GIRD FOR FIGHT AGAINST NONAGGRESSION PACT—HONOR GERMAN ESCAPEES ON 2D ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN WALL

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 13, 1963.—Paying tribute to over 16,000 German escapees and some 65 dead on the second anniversary

of the Russian wall of shame in Berlin, the National Captive Nations Committee today urged its State and local groups to oppose any unqualified nonaggression pact with imperio-colonial Moscow.

The chairman of the committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, said in a statement: "This second anniversary of Moscow's infamous Berlin wall is an occasion for all Americans to honor the courage of the German escapees and those who died in their leap to freedom. We sincerely hope the President will expressively take the lead in this."

Referring to an anticipated campaign in this country for a nonaggression pact in the name of "peace," the statement called this second anniversary also "an occasion—following the most successful Captive Nations Week last month—for preparations to oppose strenuously any pact that fails to entail heavy concessions for freedom on the part of Moscow." The author of the Captive Nations Week resolution pointed out that in our negotiations we should press for these concessions on two dimensions of freedom—free elections in the captive nations of Central Europe and the constitutional right for secession by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

"In point of cold logic," the statement read, "for us to enter into a pact with a party that in reality is in constant aggression against all these captive nations would mean a shameful acceptance of Russian aggression and the new Russian empire." The committee holds that this would be "a moral and political surrender to Moscow, which for 7 years has striven to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its empire."

The National Captive Nations Committee rejected, also, the naive notion that the limited test ban treaty is the first step toward a relaxation of tensions and the end of the cold war. "This notion," said Dobriansky, "is more the result of Moscow's psychopropaganda play on our wishful thinking than anything else." Pointing to Khrushchev's speech at the signing of the test ban treaty, he said, "We Americans should carefully read the statements coming out of Moscow to learn what peaceful coexistence means from the Russian point of view—an incessant cold war, for which we don't have an overall policy to this very day."

On the test ban treaty, which the National Captive Nations Committee regards as a terrible gamble with our national security, the statement held it to be actually the first step to a campaign for a nonaggression pact. The Captive Nations Week sponsors insist the two must be kept strictly apart, both technically and psychologically. Dobriansky stated further: "Since the illegitimate Government of East Germany has signed the treaty in Moscow, we endorse fully the idea advanced by Congressman DERWINSKI, an honorary member of the National Captive Nations Committee, to have representatives of governments in exile—Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and others—sign the test ban treaty in Washington and London."

To offset the anticipated psychological effect of the test ban treaty, as concerns Moscow's top priority item, a nonaggression pact, the committee is urging its members to intensify their efforts for the passage of the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), which calls for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. As stated by the chairman, "The creation of this committee at this time would leave no doubt in the minds of the Russian imperio-colonialists as to where the American people, represented in Congress, stand with regard to the eventual liberation of the captive nations."

CAPTIVE NATIONS CONTRASTED WITH INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY IN FREE SOCIETY

The manner and style of life in captive nations differ from that in the free society.

A man is a slave if, like a dog, he must obey the commands of his master. He may be kicked or loved, fed or starved at the master's whim. He may run or be denied any movement by his master's order.

The following statements illustrate some of the aspects of enslavement in captive nations contrasted with individual liberty in free societies where each man and woman is, or has the liberty to be his own master:

In captive nations

In the nations enslaved by communism there cannot be concern for a spiritual mission since Communists contend that insofar as this aspect of man exists subjectively it is based on error and is on the way out. Churches may be tolerated up to a point, as in Poland, but this is purely a policy of expediency. The abnormal-normal situation is that some minimum freedom of the cult (worship) is allowed churches, reconstituted as purely private societies, as the price of obedience and cooperation with the State for propaganda and international purposes.

In the total system of communism, where the only supreme being is the state and the individual is subordinated to the system, where cultural heritage and tradition is counted back only to Karl Marx, and where political and economic philosophy supplant humanistic philosophy, Judaism and Jews experience repression and persecution. Religious practices are thwarted and religious ideals are under continual assault. For freedom of conscience, Communists would substitute lack of conscience; Communists would nationalize Jewish heritage and tradition and offer in payment only the biblical "mess of porridge."

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

Communists set up hundreds of associations in countries which they run: associations of women, of writers, of scientists and institutions for sports, cultural exchange, peace and so on. This proclaimed function of all of these is to support the Communist Party and State, educate the members into acceptance and execution of Communist orders. Their publications and statements parrot those of Communist leaders. In Communist countries these groups are instruments of state power. For example: "The art of Socialist realism is a weapon in the struggle for communism. Soviet artists fully understand the party's concern for the purity and fighting efficiency of this weapon."—Sculptor Yekaterina Belashova, secretary, Board of the U.S.S.R. Artists' Union, Moscow, April 10, 1963.

All productive facilities are owned and operated by the state, there is not likely to be a counterpart of an organization of manufacturers. None of the activities permitted by such an association in the United States would be permitted.

RELIGION

In the free society

In a free society, dedicated to the principles of a truly human civilization, the state accepts the spiritual as a vital and valid aspect of the life of man. It encourages churches to do their proper work and even to be the conscience of the nation. The church is at liberty to fulfill her spiritual mission.—Dr. Charles Lowry, president, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.

"Judaism, which has in its centuries long history fathered Christianity and Islam, provides for its adherents a religious faith and philosophy which recognizes man's obligation to his fellow man and his subordination to the Almighty. It provides a cultural heritage and tradition as well." Roy H. Milenson, American Jewish Committee.

"It has been said that every situation, condition, problem, idea, thought, interest, or activity in the United States has a voluntary committee, organization, or association to deal with it. All human interests and activities are reflected by free moving groups in which all are participants, in one way or another, and which, in total, make up our American way of life.

"The 13,000 trade and professional associations in the United States represent cooperative organizations supported by competing business units brought together by mutuality of interest to improve the general interest of the members and to solve problems together which cannot be solved through individual effort. The pervasive influence and impact of all association action account for most of what is uniquely American. The sum total of benefits to the American public resulting from the constant, pervasive, usually undramatic and unheralded association influence is incalculable."—Glenn B. Sanberg, executive vice president, American Society of Association Executives.

"Our function is to promote the philosophy of economic freedom, improve relations between employers and employees, defend the rights of liberties of employers and employees, improve foreign and domestic commerce, disseminate among the people information with respect to the principles of individual liberty and the ownership of property, support national legislation in furtherance of these principles and oppose legislation in derogation thereof."—Edward Maher, vice president, National Association of Manufacturers.

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

In captive nations

The state controls, dominates and manipulates all organizations. The captive country sees no need for, and has no use for, a voluntary organization.

If, in a captive country, there is an organization by the name of chamber of commerce, it is merely a part of the government—and is set up by the government to regulate some form of industry, to police some activity of business, or to compile and publish business statistics for the government.

TRADE UNIONS

What are called "unions" in the captive nations, as in the Soviet Union itself, are agencies of the state, dedicated solely to the interests of the state. Their function is not to give workers more freedom but to control workers more effectively. To describe them as "unions" is as great an enormity as the self-description of their governments as "people's democracies."

POLITICAL PARTIES

"Marxist-Leninist parties throughout the world have before them a common ultimate aim: to mobilize all the forces for the struggle by workers and the toiling peasants to seize power for the building of socialism and communism * * * The working out of the forms and method of the struggle for socialism in every individual country is the internal affair of the working class of that country and its Communist vanguard."—Letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 31, 1963.

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

"The Komsomol is a very great and active force in our society, with more than 20 million young men and girls. Some 80 million people have passed through the Komsomol's school of Communist education and have taken part in its social-political activity. What is the main thing used by the Komsomol as a guide for its activity? * * * To help youth learn communism. To learn communism means to link the theoretical theses of our party with daily practical work. Such problems as the struggle for all branches of the national economy, the struggle to raise the productivity of labor, the struggle to improve the quality of output, and the struggle to lower our production costs are problems for economics. They interest youth so profoundly and they have become so much a part of our Komsomol organization's life that without them the existence of the Komsomol simply seems to be unthinkable."—S. P. Pavlov, First Secretary, Central Committee of the Komsomol, April 18, 1963.

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

In the free society

"In America, the chamber of commerce, may be a local organization, or it may be a State, regional or national organization. Its members are business and professional men, civic leaders and business firms. It represents the business community. It voices the philosophy of free enterprise, self-reliance and individual initiative.

"The chamber of commerce is always a voluntary organization. The central purpose of the chamber of commerce is to improve conditions in general—to improve the climate in which people live, work, and carry on business. Through the chamber of commerce, its members work together on a co-operative and voluntary basis to solve economic and social problems, to create new markets and new job opportunities, to keep the country increasingly productive and strong—and to preserve our representative form of government," Arch N. Booth, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

TRADE UNIONS

"Affiliated unions of the AFL-CIO strive continuously and successfully to improve the wages, working conditions, job security, and social benefits of workers on the job, through free collective bargaining with employers. In addition, each union, by itself, and through the AFL-CIO, works ceaselessly toward the perfection of American society as a whole. Organized labor in the United States is the people's lobby, the voice of all who work for wages and salaries, a voice that is heard in the halls of government as well as at the bargaining table," George Meany, president, AFL-CIO.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Any group of individuals may form a political party, present its platforms to the voters, and campaign for election of its candidates for public office. The aim of legitimate political parties in a free society is to identify and give voice to the political views of a majority of citizens. It is through political parties that Americans express their political wants and needs.

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Catholic Youth Organization, Christian Endeavor, the others, are organized for the purposes of encouraging self-reliance and personal growth: spiritual, physical, cultural, and social. Aspects of these programs maintain faith in God, in self, and in country. Well-rounded programs establish initiative and leadership, essential to a free society.

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommend themselves to the support of the just

aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unrelenting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and

fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while we have the undivided attention of the Members, may I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for leading a great fight for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Mr. FLOOD. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois. I could not have improved on that statement myself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend their remarks immediately following mine, and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my full support for the resolution to establish a Special

House Committee on the Captive Nations. These European nations forcefully represent the tyranny which has followed the development of world communism since its inception. It is somewhat ironic that Premier Khrushchev continually uses the term "imperialist" to refer derogatorily to Western statesmen. Since World War II his nation has embarked on one of the greatest imperialistic drives of all time. Millions of Poles, Hungarians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, East Germans, Bulgarians, Albanians, Rumanians, and Czechoslovaks have been forcibly deprived of their right to national self-determination; in most instances they have lost their civil liberties as well; and in some instances, they have been deprived of their national identities.

The formation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, something which I have supported for some time, would constitute a significant declaration of firm support for those millions of trapped individuals behind the Iron Curtain who look hopefully to the West for constructive leadership toward eventual freedom and liberty. We cannot forget these people now. I strongly recommend immediate passage of this resolution.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague, DAN FLOOD, in directing the attention of the Members of the House to the vital need for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Certainly, the nationwide attention that was evidenced throughout Captive Nations Week indicates strong public support and concern for and constant interest in the plight of the captive peoples, and I submit for the RECORD at this point, as evidence of this public interest, proclamations issued by the following Governors:

Hon. Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana.

Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York.

Hon. James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio.

Hon. Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico.

Hon. George D. Clyde, Governor of the State of Utah.

PROCLAMATION FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 14-20, 1963

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed the week of July 14-20, 1963 as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas these nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoring to them the enjoyment of their individual liberties and freedoms; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked to them by bonds of family and in the common belief that freedom and justice must prevail throughout the world, and it is proper that we give expression of our support to the people of these nations who are striving for personal liberty and independence; Now, therefore,

I, Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana, invite the citizens of Indiana to join with our sister States in observ-

ing Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor of Indiana.
CHARLES O. HENDRICKS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY STATE OF NEW YORK

The Soviets, whose spokesmen are fond of calling other people imperialists, now have an empire of no fewer than 23 captive nations. We might add Tibet to the list since its enslavement by Red China.

No fewer than 410 million people are now subject to Communist colonialism.

We know that eventually this empire will crumble as have all others amassed by force of arms. But that is poor consolation to the victims suffering oppression and unhappiness.

We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation.

We have a weapon against communism in recognition and understanding of the plight of those captive peoples. With them we look forward to the day when their enslavement shall come to an end.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14-20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

PROCLAMATION BY STATE OF OHIO

Whereas the harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive;

Now, therefore, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14-20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe.

JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION BY STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Whereas the establishment of a just and enduring peace throughout the world is essential to the survival of civilization; and

Whereas the United States supports the United Nations as it works to advance the well-being of all peoples; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has resolved that October 24, the anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter, should be dedicated each year to making known the purposes, principles, and accomplishments of the United Nations.

Now, therefore, I, Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby urge the citizens of this State to observe Thursday, October 24, 1963, as United Nations Day by means of community programs which will contribute to a better understanding of its aims, problems, and achievements.

JACK M. CAMPBELL,
Governor.

A PROCLAMATION BY STATE OF UTAH

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations; and policies of Soviet communism have resulted in the subjugation of many once-free peoples and created a vast slave empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace;

Now therefore, I, George D. Clyde, Governor of the State of Utah, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Utah to observe this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of the oppressed and subjugated people all over the world, and by other appropriate manifestations.

GEORGE D. CLYDE,
Governor of Utah.

I am especially pleased to report that a record number of communities commemorated Captive Nations Week, and I submit for the RECORD, as part of my remarks, proclamations by the following:

Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

Hon. Victor H. Schiro, mayor of New Orleans.

Hon. J. Bracken Lee, mayor of Salt Lake City.

Hon. George Christopher, mayor of San Francisco.

Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF BUFFALO

Whereas our Nation was founded and built on the precept of freedom and liberty for its citizens who hailed from all parts of the world and sought on these shores a haven for a free life, free worship, and free speech; and

Whereas our Nation since its inception has continuously advocated and supported the natural aspirations of other peoples and nations toward self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas our great Nation has demonstrated time and again its readiness to defend these ideals, bringing countless sacrifices in human life as well as material values to defend these inalienable rights; and

Whereas our Nation is facing today its greatest challenge and crisis of history by an opposing ideology based on tyranny and despotism which has no equal in history, Russian Communist imperialism; and

Whereas after the brutal suppression by Russia of the once free and independent peoples of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, China, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Poland, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, East Germany, Cossackia, Cuba, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Rumania, Hungary, and others; and

Whereas since the enactment in 1959 of Public Law 86-90, the American people have fittingly demonstrated to victims of Russian aggression that we, the American people realize their plight and support the just aspirations of the captive nations to a free and independent life; and

Whereas the alliance of the free world with the captive nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and holds the key to peace, as the captive nations are the Achilles heel of the Russian empire and their restive masses have doubtlessly hampered and prevented many aggressive designs of imperial Russia; and

Whereas it is imperative that we Americans keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts and minds of the peoples in the captive nations by showing our deep concern to their present plight and their future by strengthening their resolve to win human dignity, freedom, and national independence.

Now, therefore, I, Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through 21, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge the people of our city to observe this week as days of rededication to the cause of liberty and the dignity of man with prayers and public ceremonies, demonstrating our moral support for the just aspirations of the peoples of all the captive nations.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor of Buffalo.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Whereas universal peace and tranquillity are the goal and objective of free men in every section of the world; and

Whereas the United States derives its greatness through the democratic process, a result of harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas the Communist enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful co-existence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas Russian communism has adopted imperialistic and aggressive policies since 1918 which have resulted in the creation of a vast empire and presents a direct threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas because of direct or indirect aggression, Communist Russia has subjugated the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea,

Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled have lent support and endorsement to the Presidential proclamation which designates the period of July 14-20, 1963, to be observed as "Captive Nations Week"; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas this occasion provides Americans with the opportunity to recognize the fact that the Communist conspiracy has now spread its greedy tentacles and grasped one of our neighboring Republics, Cuba. All of this is a forceful reminder that the Soviet Union has become the largest colonial empire of our times:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the period of July 14 to 20 to be Captive Nations Week, 1963, in New Orleans.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY SALT LAKE CITY CORP.

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

Whereas it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations:

Now, therefore, I, J. Bracken Lee, mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah, do hereby designate the week July 14 through 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of Salt Lake City to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Whereas in accordance with Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted by the 86th Congress, authorizing the third week of July each year to be proclaimed "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world, the period of July 14-20, 1963, will be observed throughout the United States as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have emphasized the need for our people to learn more about the captive nations, and this fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week again provides an occasion for all Americans to show the people of the captive nations that they are not forgotten in their hopes for achieving liberty and independence; and

Whereas the people of our Nation have many roots in the various captive countries, and it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people express their interest in the freedom of other nations:

Now, therefore, I, George Christopher, mayor of the city and county of San Fran-

cisco, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14-20, 1963, to be Captive Nations Week in San Francisco, and I do urge all citizens to join in appropriate observances thereof and to support the just aspirations of all peoples for national freedom and independence.

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF CHICAGO

Whereas by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the city of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive, and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas the peoples of these Communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the city of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs;

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communications to observe the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at the program to be held at the band shell in Grant Park on Sunday afternoon, July 14, at 2 o'clock.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

I am very happy to note, as I have included proclamations from the various mayors, that issued by the Honorable Richard J. Daley of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, while we note the concrete accomplishments and results of Captive Nations Week, we must also realistically take stock of certain failures and questionable developments. Following this thought, I place into the RECORD at this point a letter from an unnamed citizen, commenting on Mayor Wagner's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, and an article by Columnist Fulton Lewis, Jr., analyzing the President's proclamation:

MYSTERIES AROUND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION IN NEW YORK CITY

Thousands of New Yorkers were amazed this year to learn for the first time since 1959 that there was no official observance of Captive Nations Week at New York's City Hall. Every year—in 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962—there was an official ceremony at which the officials of the city of New York participated in these meaningful ceremonies. In the past Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York was the honorary chairman of the Captive

Nations Week Committee, and as a rule, he not only issued the captive nations proclamation, but personally delivered his address. In 1962, it is to be recalled, Mayor Wagner was in Germany during the Captive Nations Week observances, but he sent a telegram with warmest wishes for the successful celebration of this significant event. Moreover, Mayor Wagner wrote letters to President Kennedy urging him to issue an early proclamation of Captive Nations Week. Last year, as in the previous years, the New York City Hall celebration was handled skillfully by Comdr. James Farrell, director of special events, and Mr. Thomas J. Cuite, councilman of Brooklyn, two outstanding citizens of New York, who had the interest of all the captive nations at heart.

But what a difference this year? Representatives of the captive nations organizations as usual approached city hall to start planning an impressive observance of Captive Nations Week. But all during the month before July 14, 1963—the first day of the Captive Nations Week—they were given assurance that the program would be handled by the mayor's office. Attempts to obtain details were fruitless. However, it was stated that Mayor Wagner's assistants, Messrs. Julius Edelstein and Andrew Valusek, both of whom were recently appointed as his aids by the Nationality Division of the National Democratic Committee, were planning the arrangements of the issuance of the proclamation by the mayor. They stated that Mr. Cuite would not handle the program this year.

But July 14, 1963, arrived, and there was no advance proclamation of Captive Nations Week, nor were there any preparations made for the official observance at city hall as was the case in the past 4 years. One excuse given was that the mayor had to leave for Paris to visit his sick son.

Although Mayor Wagner had returned to New York on Friday night, July 12, 1963, there was no proclamation for July 14, despite the fact that many telephone calls had been made to city hall, as well as personal interventions. Monday noon a delegation visited the mayor's office and a representative advised that no plans had as yet been scheduled for holding any ceremony. A proclamation was not ready but was being prepared. At this same time groups of people representing different captive nations were milling around asking for information about the program.

Finally, on Tuesday, July 16, 1963, the office of the mayor decided to issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation. Only a handful of representatives were notified to come to the mayor's conference room on Tuesday noon, where Deputy Mayor Edward J. Cavanagh, Jr., read the proclamation before a crowded room, many in native costumes and with national flags.

But what a proclamation.

It was an emaciated text, making reference to 10 captive nations and 120 million people only, despite the fact that the congressional resolution enumerates 22 captive nations of Europe and Asia.

There is no question that great moral and political harm was done to both Mayor Wagner and the captive nations as a whole. We know definitely that Mayor Wagner is a great friend of all the captive nations.

But it would appear that his immediate aids and assistants were trying to deviate from his record of steady support of the captive nations and to get away from the traditional observances of the Captive Nations Week altogether. Whatever it was, one thing is sure and definite as that night follows day:

New York's City Hall failed this year to uphold its tradition for having an official observance of Captive Nations Week, despite the fact that the metropolitan area of New York has hundreds of thousands of friends

of the captive nations, and despite the fact that Mayor Wagner is chairman of the Nationality Division of the National Democratic Committee.

The masters of the captive nations in Moscow must certainly be overjoyed that New York City, the great cosmopolitan center and the seat of the United Nations, has played down the manifestations of its traditional loyalty and friendship to the principle of freedom and liberation of all the captive nations.

Not so long ago (January 1963), the Communist review in Moscow, the New Times, has called on Americans to discard the observances of Captive Nations Week, inasmuch as this observance was as much a "dead horse as was the Hungarian question."

There are some people on this side of the Atlantic that appear to agree with that type of thinking.

AN ANGRY GOTHAMITE.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD an editorial of July 17 from the New York Journal American; an article of July 12 from the West Virginia Register; a July 14 article from the New York Herald Tribune; an article of July 22 from the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N.Y., and a Resolution and Statement of the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia—which are positive demonstrations of the interest in the just aspirations of the captive peoples.

[From the Hazleton Standard-Speaker, May 23, 1963]

KENNEDY'S PROMISE TO CAPTIVE NATIONS FORGOTTEN

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk has been accused of gross deception in his relations with congressional leaders.

His actions strike at the very "integrity" of the executive branch, according to Senator Thomas Dodd, influential Connecticut Democrat.

Time after time, members of Congress have been assured that Rusk planned no change in U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Only last December, Dodd and four colleagues wrote Rusk asking that our U.N. delegation be instructed to "stand firm" on Hungary.

"We are deeply concerned," they wrote, "over recurring reports that the United States may be considering a change in attitude toward the Hungarian question on the U.N. agenda."

The Senators DODD, MCCARTHY, KEATING, MUNDT, and SCOTT—were assured the reports were erroneous. Then came the first shift in U.S. policy.

The United States agreed to dismiss Sir Leslie Munro of Australia as special U.N. representative on Hungary. Sir Leslie, who had performed yeoman service in his tireless efforts to win Hungarian justice, was replaced by Secretary General U Thant, a Burmese neutralist who promptly made it known the Hungarian question was dead as far as he was concerned. He then abolished the special U.N. broadcasts to Hungary, which often gave its captive people the only non-Communist news they received.

Although Dodd and his colleagues did not then know it, another U.S. policy had undergone change. American envoys began to mingle socially with their Hungarian counterparts. The State Department rationale: "It served as an intelligence pipeline into the Hungarian delegation."

Soon even that pretense was dropped. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was host to Hungarian Ambassador Karoly Csatorday at his Texas ranch. L.B.J. and his Lady Bird gave Comrade Csatorday the red carpet treatment, then rode with them and other U.N. envoys in a special parade through San Antonio,

The policy shift is now almost complete. In a paper prepared for congressional leaders, the State Department has announced that Ambassador Adlai Stevenson will no longer oppose seating the Hungarian delegation.

The reason: Kadar and company have proclaimed an amnesty for anti-Communist political prisoners. Hungarian refugees, whose contacts behind the Iron Curtain are remarkably good, call the "amnesty" a sham.

Congressional reaction has been violent. Senator DODD, one of the most eloquent foes of communism in Washington, says the shift comes close to "destroying the last hopes of the captive peoples."

Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Illinois Democrat, is incredulous:

"For anyone to suggest that the time has come for the United Nations to accept the Kadar credentials is to make a mockery of freedom, justice, and human dignity."

Note: One other statement is now worth repeating: "The godless tyranny that has fastened itself on the great nations of Eastern Europe—on Hungary, on Poland, on Czechoslovakia, on Rumania, on East Germany, on Bulgaria—can never be overthrown by an America working halftime."

"And it cannot be overthrown by empty promises at election time . . . I say the people of East Europe do not deserve to be forgotten. And I say they won't be under a Democratic Administration."

"We must make it clear to all the world that we will never accept as a final solution Soviet colonialism in East Europe. We must seek through positive action in the United Nations to hold the searchlight of world opinion on Soviet brutality."

The speaker, John Kennedy. His searchlight, apparently, has burned out.

[From the New York Journal-American, July 17, 1963]

THE CAPTIVES

This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

It serves to remind us that:

1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime, that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

Further, as "Editor's Report" by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. "The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action."

We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

ELLIS ISLAND CALLED PERFECT PLACE FOR MEMORIAL

(By Robert E. Ramsey)

(The following is a brief explanation of a parade, a booklet, a drawing, and an idea.)

In 1961 I was living in Denver, Colo., and, at that time, I was a member of the American Legion. I had joined Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post No. 1 only a few months

prior to September 9, the day on which the 43d National Convention of the American Legion opened in Denver.

As a member of the post's Americanism committee, headed by James P. Eakins, former post commander, I had suggested to Mr. Eakins that we form a unit honoring the captive nations that would march in the Legion parade September 11.

I believed that these nations could best be represented by their national flags and it was agreed that a place for such a unit would be found in the parade.

Although time and other factors were against us, we managed to form a unit of 13 flags of captive nations (there are 22 captive nations mentioned in Public Law 86-90). The flags were carried by men from Lowry Air Force Base, Denver. In front of them marched four legionnaires, two carrying a banner that read:

"The American Legion Salutes the Captive Nations," flanked on each side by a man carrying a U.S. flag.

In order to generate interest in what has been accomplished on behalf of the captive peoples in one isolated instance, I wrote a booklet, "Flags of the Captive Nations."

Published in April 1962, the booklet carried a brief history of the 13 captive nations which were represented in the Legion parade. It also contained Public Law 86-90 and, in the foreword, how other groups and individuals could help inform the public on the plight of these captive peoples.

The response to the booklet was overwhelming. I received letters from people all over the Nation, many of them from refugees of these same countries who were not citizens of the United States.

Al Ware, editorial artist of the Denver Catholic Register, was one person who greatly assisted me in the publication of these booklets. There were many others. Al drew a striking cover for the booklet in addition to providing the necessary artwork on the 13 flags, which appeared above their respective nations.

All this while, I thought there should be some sort of a permanent memorial to the captive nations, which would rise as a beacon of hope to the enslaved while at the same time become a constant reminder to the people of the United States that all of us should be ever aware of these nations and that we should work and pray for their liberation.

I talked this over with Mr. Ware and he drew the picture of the proposed memorial to the captive nations that appears above. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

Of course, an undertaking of this kind poses many problems and not the least of them is: Where could such a memorial be built? At first, I believed an appropriate site could be found on the campus of one of our universities or colleges.

I now think that the perfect place for such a memorial would be Ellis Island, which has been vacated since 1954. It was formerly the U.S. center where immigrants to this Nation were processed. Many of these immigrants were forced to leave their homelands because of Communist oppression and I think it is only fitting that should this memorial be realized, no better place than Ellis Island could be found on which to build it.

In the June 20, 1963, issue of the Long Island Catholic there is a picture of Ellis Island. Its layout is strikingly similar to the drawing that Mr. Ware composed for the memorial, although I know that he did not have the island in mind when he drew it.

The outline under the newspaper picture of Ellis Island says it is "the subject of a dilemma." In other words, What is to become of it? I sincerely believe it should become the site for the memorial to the captive nations.

It has been pointed out to me that for such a suggestion to become a reality it would be necessary to have a congressional

resolution introduced in the U.S. House and Senate. I hope such a resolution will be introduced and that the people of this country will support it by writing letters of approval to their Congressmen.

With God's help and the help and interest of us all, a memorial to the captive nations can be realized.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 14, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: THE WEEK K. SQUIRMS

WASHINGTON.—An annual event that infuriates Soviet Premier Khrushchev began today.

It is the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, which Congress set aside through a public law in 1959 to remind the world that 900 million people, most of them once free, are now living under communism behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

President Kennedy again proclaimed the observance in conformance with the law, but his choice of words was purposely mild so as not to complicate the overriding problem of easing East-West tensions.

When former President Eisenhower signed the first proclamation in 1959, Mr. Khrushchev reacted fiercely, charging it was "a hysterical campaign in the United States to discredit communism." He asserted angrily that "the only enslaved peoples tries."

Moscow—troubled by ideological difficulties with Red China and sensitive to the theme of this year's observance—"liberate Cuba"—is again expected to react bitterly. The Communists are well aware of the significance of the occasion and are especially irritated when branded "imperialists," "colonialists," or "aggressors," appellations normally reserved for the West.

From New York to Seattle, Miami to Honolulu, groups are gathering to hold religious services, rallies, parades, special dinners, and kindred activities which Congressmen, city and State officials and other dignitaries will attend.

While the theme is "Liberate Cuba," similar slogans will be voiced in support of the formerly free peoples of 24 Communist-dominated countries.

In Washington, a 9-day observance began Friday with a breakfast at which Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, Representative JOHN O. MARSH, Republican of Virginia, and Dr. Peter Lejins, of the Latvian Association, spoke. Formal activities will end next Sunday, with wreath-laying ceremonies at the monuments of heroes of the various captive nations.

After last year's observance, Izvestia, the official Russian Government newspaper, assailed the celebrations as being "unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander."

The paper sneeringly asked if the more than 700,000 U.S. soldiers based in Europe were observing the week and attacked President Kennedy's proclamation as "a shallow formula of throwing the blame from a sick head to a healthy one."

The celebration is guided on a national level by the National Captive Nations Committee which lists former President Hoover as its honorary chairman and 85 Congressmen as honorary members.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, committee chairman, said that this year Taiwan, Formosan capital of Nationalist China, is undertaking a variety of activities as an expansion upon its first national observance last July. The committee also has written the Governments of Turkey, Iran, the United Arab Republic, Morocco, and others encouraging them to observe the week.

An integral part of this year's observance is aimed at winning support for a House resolution which would establish a special 10-member committee on the captive nations.

Under the measure, introduced by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of

Pennsylvania, the committee would study the "captive non-Russian nations * * * (and) facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes * * * to regain national and individual freedom."

[From the Post-Standard, Syracuse, N.Y., July 22, 1963]

PROFESSOR PROPOSES PLAN FOR DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM

(By Pat McGovern)

A five-point plan to defeat communism was outlined last night by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren during his address to the captive nations rally at LeMoyne College.

The political science professor asked that the United States stop economic trade and break diplomatic relations with Communist countries and that U.S. citizens solidify friendships with people behind the Iron Curtain.

He also asked that Americans encourage Congress to establish a permanent Captive Nations Committee and that the Karsten amendment be activated.

This amendment is a \$100 million a year program for the liberation of people behind the Iron Curtain.

The Citizen's Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week in Syracuse and Onondaga County sponsored the rally climaxing the week. It was attended by about 400 persons.

ALL TYRANNY PASSES

Dr. Bouscaren said "The day will come when freedom will be restored to the captive nations because all tyranny passes" as did the Nazi tyranny.

But it is the duty of all free peoples, he said, "to play an active role in aiding the erosion of tyranny."

The program's theme was "Liberate Cuba" and Dr. Bouscaren said, "since Cuba is the most exposed of the satellite nations" this is the easiest country in which to reverse the Communist situation."

SURRENDER BY INSTALLMENT

The choice, he stated, is not between co-existence or a nuclear holocaust but rather between "surrender on the installment plan" or victory over Russia by means of his five-point plan.

He also urged reestablishment of the Cuban blockade, adherence to the Organization of American States suggestion of greater isolation of Cuba, and a return to sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and hit-and-run raids on Cuba.

Those assembled at the rally voted unanimously to send a resolution to the United Nations appealing to the member states to openly condemn Russian imperialism and exploitation" and asking for a speedy return of independence and freedom of self-government to the countries enslaved by Moscow. Stephen M. Obremski, a member of the committee conducted the first part of the program.

TELEGRAMS

Telegrams and letters supporting and encouraging the Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week have been received by John K. Dungey, committee chairman, from Representative R. Walter Riehlman, Senator Kenneth A. Keating, and Dr. Michael Lohaza, a member of the Ukrainian Congress Committee now traveling in the Ukraine.

Also speaking was Rev. Thomas P. Tuite, dean of men at LeMoyne College. He noted that "we the people shall never condone tyranny" and said the proclamation adopted by those assembled is "intended to bring hope to those people behind the Iron Curtain."

ART OF CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Artistic presentations were given by the American Legion Post 41 Chorus; Symphonia

Polish Choral Society; the Latvian Folk Dancers, the Armenian Chorus, the Ukrainian Male Chorus "Surma," "Polonez" Male Chorus and the Latvian Academic Association.

Also Olgo Nagy and Zoltan Koran presented Hungarian folk dancers, Manivald Loite directed Estonian folk songs; Karoly Safran, violinist, rendered Hungarian folk tunes, and Lithuanian folk songs, recorded, directed by Alfonsas Mikulskis and Atonas Gimzauskas were heard.

Master of ceremonies was Mykola Bohatink.

PARTICIPATING GROUPS

The participating organizations were the Armenian Community Center, Estonian Lutheran Church, the Hungarian Committee, the Latvian Academic Association, Latvian American Society, Polish Community Home, Polish American Congress, "Free China" Committee, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Conservative Council, and American Legion Post 41.

Honorary cochairmen of the observance were Mayor William F. Walsh, of Syracuse, and John P. Mulroy, Onondaga County executive.

The captive nations cited last night include Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Communist China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkistan, Ukraine, Croatia, Slovenia, and North Caucasus.

Members of the Captive Nations Week Committee are Andres Paap, Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Arnold V. Goltz, Chairman Dungey, Obremski, and Dr. Bouscaren.

[From the Post-Standard, Syracuse, N.Y., July 22, 1963]

THE MORNING'S MAIL: CALLS COEXISTENCE DEFEATIST POLICY

To the Editor of the Post-Standard:

The policy today for defeating communism is no policy at all; it is nothing but an accommodation with this Red atheistic slavery. "Coexistence" is the name. It is defeatism, and will in the end mean the total enslavement of the world under communism.

Presently our Government is hellbent on disarmament. In three steps we will dismantle our Military Establishment and create an all-powerful peace force under the United Nations. This policy of stripping the United States of its military strength and eventually its freedom is spelled out in State Department Document No. 7277 and is being implemented today by policies that are weakening our military stature.

By virtue of a secret agreement made in 1945, the head of security for the U.N. is a Soviet citizen and who, in effect, is head of military forces of the U.N. Recently U Thant appointed another Soviet citizen to this all-powerful post, leaving an unbroken line of Soviet citizens holding this post since the beginning of the U.N.

Are we, as Americans, willing to dismantle our military and place it in the hands of our mortal enemy—the Soviet Union? The people of this country must answer this—but quick. Communism fears strength, but welcomes weakness.

We must have a win policy over communism, based on Christian-Judaic principles of truth, trust, honor, loyalty, and what is best for America. We must break off diplomatic relations with all Communist countries, thus taking away the false cloak of respectability that these nations have used all these years in promoting their brand of slavery.

Also in one sweep we will remove spy nests in this country, operating in embassies and elsewhere under diplomatic immunity. We should break off all trade and cultural rela-

tions as these are also used as an instrument of conquest.

Discontinue all economic and military aid to any so-called ally or neutral who chooses to trade with the Communist bloc. Recognize exile governments of those countries now under Communist domination and do all possible to assist in their liberation.

Hitch our foreign policy to the star of American freedom and not to the Red star of slavery.

JOHN K. DUNGEY.

RESOLUTION BY THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas there are many millions of human beings whose individual freedoms are suppressed by Communist tyranny and whose nations are held captive by the imperialistic conquests of the Soviet Union and Red China; and

Whereas these millions of human beings are brethren to the more fortunate individuals who comprise this great Nation of ours; and

Whereas the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence, and our Bill of Rights have inspired human beings throughout the entire world to revolt against tyranny and declare their national independence: Be it

Resolved by the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia in meeting assembled this 17th day of June 1963, That on this fourth annual anniversary of Captive Nations Week, we, the District of Columbia Young Republicans, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Communist masters, and do extend our sentiments and invite every American concerned with the freedom of our Nation to participate with us, and rededicate themselves to the cause of individual freedom and national independence; not only during the week of July 14-20, but every week throughout the year; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Congress, and that copies be released to the various news media.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

At our monthly meeting held on June 17, the District of Columbia Young Republicans affirmed the principles of the Eisenhower administration pertaining to Captive Nations Week. The club overwhelmingly endorsed the Captive Nations Week resolution. The reasoning behind this resolution was that the Kennedy administration had sidestepped and avoided endorsing this proclamation for the past 2 years. Only as an afterthought did Kennedy proclaim Captive Nations Week. Dean Rusk has consistently discouraged the formation of a Captive Nations Committee.

We of the District of Columbia Young Republicans wish to melt some of the wax out of Kennedy's ears regarding communism. It is obvious to us that communism is the greatest threat to freedom and the greatest obstacle to the extension of freedom in the world. Communism preaches and practices the doctrine of slavery and is dedicated to the destruction of all of the values we Americans prize. It is probable that the weakness and ineptitude demonstrated by the Kennedy administration in Berlin, in permitting the construction of the hated wall, caused the Communists to move on Cuba.

We do not propose to melt the heart of Khrushchev by being cordial to him—for it will not work. Tyranny is still the suppression of individual liberties and the aggressive colonialism of the Soviets is subjugation of free people. We of the United States are continually trying to perfect our freedoms, but we do not live in serfdom as do the more than 800 million comprising the captive nations.

Our ultimate weapon is the inherent desire for freedom and self-determination for all men.

We rededicate ourselves to this cause.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, has fought vigorously for the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and as evidence of the growing support we are receiving from House Members, I submit a translation of an editorial from Draugas, commending the participation of the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman MADDEN, in support of this committee; also letters which were reprinted in the Harenik Weekly from our colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Tom O'NEIL, JR., and the gentleman from California, BERNIE SISK:

[From Draugas, Chicago, Ill., July 19, 1963]
THE CONCLUSION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND THE HOPES FOR LIBERATION

The Captive Nations Week that began on July 14 is about to end. Now we can have a fairly good idea of how it passed and how much it contributed to the liberation of captive nations.

There cannot be two opinions about its usefulness—it was high, although even more could have been accomplished. Captive Nations Week was commemorated in many larger cities. Some of the governors followed the President's lead and proclaimed Captive Nations Week. So did the mayors of several cities, and even smaller towns followed suit.

We also noted friendly statements about the captive nations in the press as well as good coverage of the Captive Nation's Week events. Some of the dailies published editorials. All this is good, and persons who have been heading the commemoration activities deserve full credit.

It is extremely important that the U.S. Congress joined in action. We noted that numerous Senators and Representatives made excellent statements on the floor during this past week, effectively spotlighting the captive nations problem. This, too, represents an important achievement.

Representative RAY MADDEN was one who spoke. Upon thanking Representative FLOOD for his leadership in commemorating Captive Nations Week during the July 15 session, Mr. MADDEN brought back the fact that Nikita Khrushchev became enraged when he learned that the U.S. Congress had voted to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Mr. MADDEN stressed the Soviet leaders' fear that the annual commemorations of Captive Nations Week would remind the world every time that the European captive nations remain victims of Soviet military force and aggression. Speaking with Mr. MADDEN, Communist propaganda has been trying for years to convince the world that the captive nations submitted to Soviet domination of their free will and are pleased with Soviet slavery.

Representative MADDEN is not a pessimist. He hopes that the enslaved peoples will—sooner or later—regain freedom from Soviet slavery. The Soviets themselves are already changing their attitude toward the West. This being so, Nikita Khrushchev and other tyrants begin to recognize that the captive nations will not break down, nor will they renounce their desire to become free and take over order and government in their countries.

These nations are only waiting for a propitious opportunity, possibly arising out of the quarrel between the Kremlin and Communist China. Should disagreements between these two Communist powers sharpen, they may erupt in unexpected events and furnish an opportunity for the captive nations to

regain freedom. These were the thoughts Representative MADDEN expressed on the floor in the U.S. Congress.

We have stated at the outset that it was necessary to do more in order to commemorate Captive Nations Week yet on a larger scale. Representatives MADDEN, FLOOD, DERWINSKI, and others express a very sound opinion that now is no time for detente. One must strengthen spiritual collaboration with the captive nations. The United States has until now given support to their yearning for freedom; it shall continue giving even stronger support in the future.

Representative MADDEN is a member of the House Rules Committee, and he keeps urging his colleagues on the committee to endorse the resolution seeking to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. He is trying to secure the passage of the resolution during the present session.

Such a committee not only would show concern about the captive nations, but would also conduct inquiries into their plight and inform the world of the tyrannical methods by which millions of captive people are tortured behind the Iron Curtain.

Should this resolution pass, resulting in the establishment of a permanent House Committee, then the commemoration of Captive Nations Week could be conducted on a much larger scale in the future. It is our duty, therefore, to do what we can in urging our Congressmen to give unfailing support to the passage of this important resolution.

We sincerely hope that, in addition to the other positive achievements during the Captive Nations Week, a big step will be taken toward the speediest passage of the resolution establishing the House Committee on Captive Nations.

CONGRESSMEN O'NEILL, SISK PLEDGE SUPPORT IN HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

EDITOR'S NOTE: In the following letters received by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia on June 27, Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Massachusetts, and BERNIE F. SISK, California, both members of the influential House Committee on Rules, announced their support of House Resolutions 14 and 15, establishing formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. The legislation, advanced by Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI, has been held up in the Rules Committee. Both letters appeared in the July 4, 1963, issue of the *Hairenik Weekly*, published in Boston, Mass.

Thank you for your letter with reference to House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

You may be assured that I shall continue to use my best efforts to secure favorable action on these measures both in the House Committee on Rules and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Thank you for your letter of June 21 with reference to House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

You may be assured of my support of this legislation and I will do what I can to get it out of Rules Committee and to the floor for a vote.

I appreciate your comments on my Armenian Independence Day speech and I am glad you have been able to make use of it.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

BERNIE SISK,
Member of Congress.

Further evidence and necessary comment concerning the reason for the

growing interest in the subject is contained in an article which appeared in the July 15 issue of the *Journal American*:

[From the New York Journal-American, July 15, 1963]

NOT MUCH CHANCE FOR A "SELLOUT"

(By John Chamberlain)

This is Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed, perhaps with some embarrassment, by President Kennedy—and it comes, truly, at a strange conjunction of the stars.

On the one hand, the sponsors of the week, the insistently active National Captive Nations Committee, with Herbert Hoover as its honorary chairman, and the fire-breathing Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University as its working head, is busy deplored our "many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later."

"Beyond all rationality," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a 'breather' to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

While Dr. Dobriansky speaks with an iron voice, however, the administration obviously hopes that Khrushchev, with Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman waiting on his doorstep, will not take any of this "sturm und drang" stuff on the part of the Captive Nations Committee too seriously.

It is not that anybody contemplates a conscious "sellout" of Eastern European hopes in exchange for a nuclear test ban pact with the Soviets. The idea of an "opening to the East," which was first explored by the Vatican, is something that is conceived in expectation of a quid pro quo. The theory behind it all is that Soviet Russia has actually been undergoing a mutation, or a sea-change, and is ready to ease up on the captive nations.

The "things that are God's" in Poland and Hungary, so the hopes run, will be freed from secular or political interference; the churches will be allowed to preach and practice Christianity without hindrance; and some measures of civil liberty might be expected to follow in an atmosphere purged of religious tensions.

When this columnist put the foregoing case for the "opening to the East" to organizers of Captive Nations Week, however, he got a short answer: "Crumbs." He also got a prediction that the Kennedy administration, for all the hopes that Averell Harriman may carry with him to Moscow, will not dare settle for crumbs.

Khrushchev is already on record as being willing to accept a test ban agreement that would cover nuclear explosions in the air or underwater provided the NATO nations are ready to sign a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its East European "allies." But the trade of pact for pact, short of including along with it a Soviet guarantee of free elections in the East European satellites, will almost certainly never be made.

For one thing, a pact is a treaty, and all treaties to which the United States is a signatory must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate under the "advice and consent" clause of the Constitution. It is impossible to visualize two-thirds of the Senate signing away the hopes of the East European captive peoples, or granting what would amount to recognition of the long-term legitimacy of the East German Communist State.

If you don't believe the Senate would put its collective foot down on a treaty that would consign Eastern Europe to the Soviets in perpetuity, just take a look at the list of honorary members of the National Captive Nations Committee. The list includes Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois,

FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, KEATING and JAVITS, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. A bipartisan list that crosses all lines, whether of party or ideology.

Moreover, there is more than idealism involved. A Scott of Pennsylvania has a Polish and Hungarian vote to worry about; a Lausche, with much of his strength in Cleveland, Ohio, has all the bloods of Eastern Europe watching him. In Connecticut, Senator THOMAS DONN cannot live politically without support from people with Polish ties.

There is one way around the U.S. Senate: an exchange of "declarations" on the part of the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact stooges would not have to run any constitutional gauntlet, for it would not have the force of a treaty. But one cannot conceive of such a "declaration" passing muster with the West Germans or with De Gaulle.

The worries about a "sellout" this week, then, are not very real, even if Averell Harriman might be complaisant, which is extremely doubtful, anyway.

Mr. Speaker, it is worthy to note that international attention has now been given this issue, and there are two worthwhile documents which have been directed to my attention, emphasizing the support of the Chinese Nationalist Government for the just aspirations of the captive peoples. As evidence, I submit a press release issued by the Government Information Office of the Chinese Nationalist Government, quoting a statement of President Chiang Kai-shek, and in a rally marking Captive Nations Week, we find a vigorous speech by Vice Premier Wang Yun-Wu, as worthy of our attention:

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICE OF CHINESE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

TAIPEI.—President Chiang Kai-shek today declared the Chinese Communists must be overthrown so that captive nations can be set free and "everlasting peace" brought to the world.

The President's statement was made in a message to a city hall mass meeting in support of the U.S.-initiated Captive Nations Week.

President Chiang called attention to the conflict between the Soviet Union and Chinese Communists, and said that it is a "struggle for power" that "indicates the bankruptcy of the Communist ideology and the decline of the international Communist movement."

He said the Republic of China "must take advantage of this opportunity" to join with other free peoples in support of anti-Communist revolution on the mainland.

Text of the message, addressed to Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the mass meeting, follows:

"Since the end of World War II, the international Communists, seeking to dominate the world and enslave mankind, have successively seized Eastern European countries, the Chinese mainland, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

"Millions of people in these areas have been shut behind the Iron Curtain and subjected to Communist persecution. In order to survive and regain their freedom, many of these peoples have either staged revolts or fled at the risk of their lives.

"The U.S. Government, as a gesture of sympathy and support for enslaved peoples, initiated the Captive Nations Week movement in 1959. It has been observed annually in July.

"The movement has received strong support in various free areas and has developed

into an international undertaking to support the liberation of captive peoples. Such an effort has profound meaning.

"We firmly believe that freedom cannot coexist with slavery. We must not tolerate the present world state in which half of the people are free and the other half enslaved. If we cannot destroy the Iron Curtain and help enslaved peoples regain their freedom, international communism will extend its tentacles to bring all the world under its control.

"I have said repeatedly that all the trouble in the world today has its root in Asia. The world shall have no peace unless the Communist menace in the Chinese mainland is eradicated. To deliver the suffering people behind the Iron Curtain, the Chinese Communist regime must be toppled first.

"The present Moscow-Peking ideological dispute, which in reality is a struggle for power, is deteriorating into intensified mutual denunciation. This indicates the bankruptcy of the Communist ideology and the decline of the international Communist movement. The Chinese Communists are isolated in international relations and face agonizing internal political, economic, military, and social crises and disasters resulting from their inhuman policies.

"To cover up their failures, the Communists have aggravated the enslavement and oppression of the people and plunged them into an abyss of suffering. The people's detestation of Communist rule has grown in proportion to the worsening of this despotism. They have sought to revolt or escape. Successive revolts have erupted and refugees have streamed out of the Chinese mainland. A year ago last May a mass refugee exodus moved across the border into Hong Kong. Despite intensified controls and border patrols, refugees and defectors have continued their flights to freedom.

"We free Chinese must take advantage of this opportunity to cooperate among ourselves and unite with peace-loving peoples of the world to support the anti-Communist uprisings now raging on the mainland. We must destroy the Peking regime in order to recover the mainland and free the people there. This will assure the deliverance of all captive nations and bring everlasting peace to the world."

THE FOLLOWING IS A FULL TEXT OF SPEECH BY VICE PREMIER WANG YUN-WU ON JULY 19, 1963, AT A MASS RALLY MARKING THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Today is the second day from the last of the Captive Nations Week, 1963. Nevertheless, there shall never be a last day for our antienslavement campaign, which we shall carry on to the day when all the captive peoples of the world shall have regained freedom, as our conscience and sense of responsibility so dictate.

The concept that men are created equal and free has not only directed the course of Western history but also been stressed in the rationalism of the Chinese philosophy. The Confucian philosophy espousing benevolence upholds the value and dignity of man. As Confucianism has been deep-rooted in Chinese culture, there has never been a strong class consciousness in China. Slavery has been nonexistent. Therefore, we can say that the Chinese have always enjoyed and loved freedom. The Western history for a long time had been marred by slavery until in the 18th century when rationalism was revived. The ancient Greek philosophy championing individual freedom had a rebirth through advocacy of the 18th century philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau. The American independence in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789 were results of men's struggle for freedom and equality. The two great revolutionary documents of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration des

Droits de L'homme et du Citoyen perpetuated the watchwords "liberty" and "equality" as the rightful aspirations and aims of all men. It was then that the social class and slave systems were "put to death." We believe it is human nature to aspire individual freedom, equality, and dignity, and the philosophy espousing them has been a precious legacy of human civilization. On this point, the East and the West meet each other.

The human history, viewed from whatever angles, is a record of men's pursuit of freedom and equality, for which philosophers have dedicated their minds and martyrs their blood unconditionally. Ever since the 18th century, it has become a deep-rooted conviction in the minds of men that all men should enjoy freedom and equality. Nevertheless, this liberalism based on rationality has continuously been ravished by such fanaticism as nazism and fascism evolved from Nietzsche's supermen philosophy. The Nazis and Fascists styled themselves as the chosen people and had the ambition to become masters of the world and to enslave all the peoples whom they considered inferior to their own. However, they were mistaken and completely crushed. The Judge of history made a just verdict. Men are born with the rights for freedom and equality. None is born a master or a slave.

Nevertheless, a freak has existed in history. Alongside with people pursuing freedom and equality are always fanatics who attempt to obstruct such pursuit without heed to the lessons taught by history. As soon as the phantoms of nazism and fascism had died out, the shadows of communism swooped down upon the world. Since the end of World War II, the Communists, with Russia as headquarters, followed the Nazis and Fascists to make drastic expansion with the purpose of establishing a Communist empire. In less than one decade, some 1 billion people were shut behind the Iron Curtain. Communism is now posing a serious threat to world peace, and has left the world half free and half enslaved.

As we know, communism is founded on materialism which negates the mental and spiritual value of man and puts man on the equal footing with materials and machines. The concepts of freedom, equality and dignity of man are merely jokes in Communist dictionaries. The Communists are obsessed with dictatorship of the proletariat and world conquest. With hatred in their minds, they are determined to communize the whole world through means of either violence or smile offensive. Their aim is to build a Red empire.

The "Captive Nations Week" resolution was adopted by the U.S. Congress and the week designated by President Kennedy in 1959. The initiation of such a righteous movement further confirms the noble ideals and humanitarianism fostered by the American Independence. We shall not forget the pronouncement of the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Americans, to fulfill the political philosophy conceived by their forefathers, have engaged themselves in a civil war at the risk of national disintegration and again in the First and Second World Wars at great losses of American lives and properties. The undaunted spirit of the Americans to lay down their lives readily for justice has enabled their nations to become, in less than two centuries, the spiritual leader of the world and a bastion for freedom. At the end of World War II, communism, which negates the dignity of man, sprang up to offer direct challenge and menace to the American political philosophy. As soon as the American perceived the many-pronged aggressive character of communism, they sprang to their feet in self-awareness to guard freedom and democracy. It was then that the Americans

completely shook off the holdover isolationism, and assumed resolutely the responsibility to maintain world peace and order.

However, we cannot but regretfully point out that the United States has always been on the defensive, and has witnessed helplessly free territories lost to the Communists and free peoples enslaved one after the other. The American Government and people may have felt sympathy toward the captive peoples and indignation toward the Communist aggression, but they have failed to take actions. The fear for a destructive nuclear war has bred widespread defeatism in the West. Many leaders of the free world have even declared their "preference of communism to death," which spells danger. This defeatist philosophy contradicts the philosophy fostered by the American Revolution. If defeatism became accepted by the Americans, the American national foundation would be shaken, and the United States would soon capitulate to the enemy without a fight. Fortunately, most of the Americans are still champions of their revolutionary philosophy which defends freedom. Nevertheless, we must solemnly point out that it is dangerous to encourage neutralism or to believe in Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence cliché. In fact, the neutralists are nothing but selfish and virtuous politicians. Their appeasement, concession and services toward the international Communists fully demonstrate their thoughtlessness of captive peoples, their selfishness and immorality.

Though we may believe that the attempts for compromise with Soviet Russia have been driven by the rightful aspiration for peace, we must point out that such attempts have pained and disheartened the people behind the Iron Curtain, as well as discolored the glorious American history. History has taught us that sacrifice of the freedom of a part of the human race will not win freedom for the rest. Tolerance of aggression will not stop it but breed a more malevolent aggression.

We are greatly concerned and grieved by the fate of the 1 billion people kept captive behind the Iron Curtain, especially of the half billion Chinese compatriots who have suffered the most on the mainland under communism. But concern and grief alone will not help them. The antienslavement campaign is also more of a ceremony and formality than of actual help to the betterment of the world situation. What we must do is to extend our love for our compatriots and for our fellowmen to liberate them by positive means. We hope that the leaders of the free world will have the determination, similar to that of Abraham Lincoln's to emancipate the Negroes, to free the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Lincoln went to war for his antislavery beliefs, and we must also have the same courage and compassion as Lincoln's to safeguard freedom at all prices, but not to make freedom a price in itself. For the sake of freedom and antienslavement, we must not fear the Communist threats of war. "Give me liberty or give me death" is still a heartening motto which we may cling to. The Chinese proverb: "It is better to break as jade than to stay intact as a tile" also sets forth a philosophy that as men, we shall live and die for freedom and equality.

In view of the overwhelming national, international, and congressional sentiment for a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, I join DAN FLOOD in urging early Rules Committee consideration of House Resolution 14.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 40 identical House resolutions for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and I feel that this body should consider this issue as soon as possible.

The need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations was suggested in the second session of the 86th Congress by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DAN FLOOD. He has been a stalwart supporter in recognizing the plight of the enslaved people behind the Communist curtains. There is a need for this Nation to continue to endorse this idea if we expect to realize a day of liberation for the world.

The 86th Congress recognized the captive nations of the world when they proclaimed a week in observance of the struggle carried on by the impoverished, enslaved people of nonaligned countries who are forced to yield to the dictates of communism under the threat of force. These people are prisoners and treated as such. They have lost the right to redress; they have lost the right to appeal. Surely this is not in accord with the humanitarian rule, "All men are created equal." Equality to these unfortunates is measured by the point of bayonets which they face. They move in the direction in which it tells them to move. They must yield to its command, so their equality is slavery.

Their only hope to survive this ordeal is through the knowledge that the free nations of the world have not forgotten them. That the free world intends to hold its ground, and, through perseverance and determination, win the battle against tyranny. It is on that victory day they will see the sun shine again. As long as these people can keep their hopes alive, we, in the free world, can check the growth of communism. For the Communists cannot take any aggressive action to further their cause knowing there is an army of people behind their front lines that could disrupt their movements should they decide this course of action.

It is true that Congress has continued to observe Captive Nations Week through the past 5 years. I have been in complete support of this proclamation as I feel this declaration does lend moral support to the people imprisoned by the Communists. But the question arises, "Is it enough?" Is apathy creeping into the idea? Was enough emphasis placed on this year's proclamation of Captive Nations Week observed from July 14-20?

The press, radio, and TV gave little or no attention to this commemoration of the horrible fact that close to a billion human beings are living in prison and misery. The public demonstrations, which were numerous and well attended the first year we proclaimed Captive Nations Week, have subsided. Could it be that we have become complacent feasting on our own liberty while millions starve for these very same rights? It could very well be that Captive Nations Week might become another National Potato Week, nice to know that it is upon us once again, but, so what else is new?

I believe we need to stimulate the cause for recognizing the captive nations of the world. Through the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations we can renew hope in the enslaved peoples. We can reawaken the consciousness of the free world to the magnitude and danger of the situa-

tion. We will arouse the conscience of the indifferent. We will create the same furor to the Communists as we did in first recognizing the captive nations. They will not be able to relax. By keeping them under constant pressure we can bury them, and they not us. We will encourage the captive people to strengthen their spirits so they can break the chains that bind them. We can arrive at solutions to aid them in this cause.

It is a move in the right direction for world liberation. There is a need for this committee to concentrate its full force in resolving the plight of the enslaved, so let us delay no longer. I hope this body will consider this need and elect to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], in urging adoption of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am happy to be among the cosponsors of the resolution.

It is my sincere belief adoption of these resolutions is long overdue.

We have a particularly good opportunity to take constructive action to rekindle the hope of millions of people living behind the Iron Curtain against their will by adopting these resolutions. At a time when great changes are taking place throughout the world, it would be my hope that the United States would lead the way in reassuring the victims of international communism that we in the United States have not forgotten them.

Creation of the Special Congressional Captive Nations Committee would help draft a comprehensive program for helping the victims of communism regain their freedom.

I strongly urge adoption of these resolutions as quickly as possible.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, the thing which we have held more sacred than any other is that all just governments derive their authority from the consent of the governed. Our generation has witnessed the rights of the people disregarded, the dignity of human beings desecrated, and sufferings imposed upon the weak by the strong.

We have seen the growth of totalitarian slavery in one form or another over the years until now such imperialism encompasses the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other nations.

Mankind prays, hopes, and yearns for peace, liberty, and happiness. But it is not enough to express our sentiments in behalf of our kinsmen who have been subjugated and to forgive those who have been responsible for the oppression. If the leaders of this movement to captivate the free spirit of people are truly sincere in their efforts for peace, they must be willing to restore the fundamental rights to those from whom they have plundered.

Why a Special Committee on the Captive Nations? We must know what action is being taken to make restitution to those who have been persecuted in the past, who may be suffering in the present, and whose future cannot be written off as a debt to the next generation. We sympathize with those endeavoring to solve these monumental problems caused by those who have no real concern for anyone but themselves. That is why we in the Congress strive for the establishment of a committee to study, evaluate, analyze, and recommend solutions to this problem. It is only by such a step that we can demonstrate our faith and desire to assist in these aspirations to regain individual and national freedoms.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been criticized by our foreign friends and our own scholars for taking what they call a simplistic view of world affairs.

I would also take exception to this generalization, except when it concerns the Communist bloc.

All too often we have been disposed to consider the Soviet empire as a massive, unfissionable monolith. We have improperly stressed the unity and strength existing between Peiping and Moscow; we have attributed more cohesiveness to the Communist bloc than it deserves. We have, in general, failed to understand that forces of erosion and the diffusion of power are at work within this political system.

We have failed in particular to understand that the Communist bloc is a complex structure of competing nationalities who are responsive to deep-seated, historic traditions of nationalism. Nationalism is still a powerful force for fragmentation and change.

Because of these blindspots in our national thinking, we were taken by surprise when Tito broke with the Cominform in 1948.

In a similar way, the Polish crisis and Hungarian revolt of 1956 left us with a feeling of disbelief. And today, we have yet to assess fully the vast implications of the clear break between Moscow and Peiping. There are many centrifugal forces within the Communist bloc that generate diffusion and erosion; but there is none so powerful as that of nationalism.

Nationalism is a curse to Communists. It runs counter to all fundamental Communist dogma. The reason is simple: Communism stresses centralization, and unified, totalitarian power; nationalism is essentially a separatist force, and separation means disintegration, which in turn means diffusion of power and finally weakness.

Ever since the founding of the multinational Soviet state, the Soviet leaders have fought against the dangerous, disruptive power of what the Communists call bourgeois nationalism. In desperation they have tried to reconcile the forces of internal Soviet nationalism with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. Sometimes, they resorted to physical force and even bloodshed, as in the Ukraine and the Baltic States, in order to achieve their goals. Even today

the suppression of nationalism is sometimes ruthless and harsh. In the past year, the press has carried many stories of the mounting attacks on Soviet Jewry. This, too, is a facet of the Soviet compulsion to destroy any sense of national feeling.

Within the Communist bloc the same corrosive force of nationalism is at work slowly eroding the sense of political solidarity. China and Soviet Russia are in open quarrel. Albania remains hostile and unreconciled to Moscow. The Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Rumanians, and other nationalities in Eastern Europe seek their own status within the formal structure of the Communist commonwealth. During the past year we have witnessed successful attempts by the Rumanians to insist that they structure their economy to suit their own particular national purposes. Poland still seeks to maintain a measure of independence from Moscow.

The spirit of nationalism is a powerful force, and it binds the captive peoples of Eastern Europe together in their hostility toward Moscow and its imperial overlords. We must understand that nationalism is our ally in the cold war.

Nationalism is, indeed, one of our greatest and most reliable allies; for if liberation is to come in Eastern Europe, it must come from a will existing within the people themselves, a will to assert their own national goals and aspirations, a will to join the family of free nations, a will to survive as free human beings.

It follows, therefore, that if we wish to hasten and encourage the forces of political disintegration within the Communist bloc, we must direct our attention to the task of encouraging the forces of nationalism. If we are to weaken world communism and put it on the defensive, we must maintain a constant alert for the opportunities that come to us. We must ever be listening to the pulsebeat of discord within Eastern Europe and be ready to act wisely to extract the greatest yield for freedom's sake.

We can do this best, I believe, by establishing a special committee in the House of Representatives on the captive nations. This committee could have the problems of Eastern Europe constantly under review. It could, as an arm independent from the executive department, act as a powerful source of influence throughout the free world by making known to all people the thirst for freedom that exists among the captive peoples. As an official institution within the U.S. Government, such a committee would be regarded as concrete evidence of our commitment as a nation to the freedom of captive peoples.

To adopt a resolution setting up this committee would be a genuine act of hope, for it would pledge to the captive peoples our resolve as a nation that one day freedom will be theirs. I have introduced a resolution, House Resolution 213, which would establish such a committee. I urge the Rules Committee to act on it in the immediate future.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tremendous interest in and the overwhelming justification for the

establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Indeed, one may find it difficult to understand why we find ourselves debating the proposal rather than reaping the benefits which would undoubtedly flow from the work of such a committee.

It would appear that a formidable obstacle lies in the path of progress toward the creation of the committee, otherwise, considering the increasingly persistent demands for its establishment, it would now be an accomplished fact.

What then is the nature of the obstacle? And, having identified it, how is it to be overcome? Apparently, there is a hesitancy on the part of some, who refer in somewhat abstract terms to a concept of "historical Russia," to lend their prestige and support to House Resolution 14. This hesitancy is rather remarkable when one realizes that so afflicted are unquestioned proponents of self-determination and outspoken opponents of the new colonialism which has made captives of more than 100 million people. One recognizes immediately the paradox inherent in such thinking but, surely, will find difficulty in explaining it.

For those who are concerned lest the creation of the committee prove inconsistent with American policy toward Russia I suggest a perusal of the many public utterances of President Kennedy. The President has stated repeatedly his opposition to colonialism in general and to the brand practiced by Moscow in particular. With reference to the President and to his statements on this issue I hardly need remind anyone that authority and responsibility for foreign policy rest with the Chief Executive. May one reasonably conclude, therefore, that the proposed committee and the issues which it would probe are clearly consistent with our advocacy of self-determination, freedom, and national integrity.

Let us consider briefly the benefits which would accrue from the work of the committee. Would not our action in establishing the Committee on the Captive Nations be viewed as a reaffirmation of the basic tenets upon which our entire structure of democratic institutions rests? Further, would not such action be viewed by the oppressed millions in the captive nations as a reaffirmation of America's active role in propagating democratic ideals? Surely, these millions who have long suffered the yoke of oppression would find new hope for a life in which the individual is master of his destiny, rather than be destined to do the bidding of a master.

Finally, is there present anyone who needs to be reminded of our own colonial status at one point in our history? Our very presence in this Chamber is testimony to the tenacity of our forefathers in clinging to the hope for a life in which they would be free from the whims of a government to which they had given no consent to be governed. They envisioned what we now enjoy, a life in which the weak are not subjugated by the strong, the poor not subjugated by the rich, the few not subjugated by the many.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy approval of the proposal that there be established

in the House of Representatives a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my distinguished colleagues in calling for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. During the week of July 15, 1963, I rose with the other Members of the House and paid tribute to the heroic and freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain, and I called upon this Congress to give even more meaningful recognition to their noble cause. Captive Nations Week has come and gone, and over 1 month has passed by and still no action has been taken to establish the special House committee. There was a great deal of oratory during Captive Nations Week, but unfortunately, the enthusiasm that was generated appears to have been short lived. Little has been done to establish the Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and it has not even been reported by the Rules Committee. Surely the time has come for our words to take root and the goals we advocate to come to fruition.

Four years ago I joined in sponsoring the joint resolution which established this significant annual national Captive Nations Week. In accordance with its terms, the President has annually designated the third week in July for the commemoration of the occasion. But these steps are not enough; we must move forward and take bolder, more meaningful action. We should not only reaffirm our sympathy and support of these millions of people suffering under Communist tyranny, but we should also express this support overtly, through continuing constructive activity. We should give this matter the serious recognition it deserves and nothing short of a special committee of the House would satisfactorily accomplish these ends.

There are now over 40 identical resolutions before the Rules Committee calling for this special committee. Unhappily, however, they have not yet been reported out. I therefore urge again a solid expression of support for these proposals. A Special Captive Nations Committee would make great strides toward the goal of freedom for the imprisoned people of the captive nations by undertaking a careful and precise study of their internal conditions so that definite steps could be taken to aid these peoples in their quest for freedom. We must assemble and utilize effectively all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of these countries. The enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding would give encouragement to the latent liberal elements in these oppressed countries.

The weapons of truth and fact generated under the impetus of the special committee would effectively counter and defeat Moscow's nefarious propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Despite the recent advances recently made in ending the bitterness of the cold war, we should not come to the point where we are conciliating the Communists to such

a degree that we blithely overlook the atrocities they are guilty of in Eastern Europe. Do we need any further demonstration of the Communist's intent than the infamous wall in Berlin, the war in South Vietnam, and missiles in Cuba? Now is the time for us to show the world, and especially those suffering under the yoke of totalitarianism, that we are indeed interested in world peace, but we will not forget the plight of those who have not seen the light of democracy since it was obscured by the Russians. We of the United States cannot rest with an easy conscience until all mankind is free.

Are we willing to trade the hope of a thaw in the cold war for the everlasting enslavement of millions of people? We cannot sell our birthright and heritage of freedom for all mankind for the potage offered by the Soviets.

It is incumbent upon us as free citizens to show the world that we are sincerely and honestly interested in freedom for all the peoples of the world. We can best show the freedom-loving peoples of the world that our true intentions are for the advancement of democracy by speedily establishing the Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I urge the careful reconsideration of this proposed committee as a vital step toward the realization of the ideal to which Captive Nations Week is dedicated—the universal reign of liberty and peace under law. Let us not forget the enslaved peoples of the world; let us, instead, work for the freedom of all.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Congressmen DANIEL J. FLOOD and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, in their plea for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The Congress of the United States has taken positive recognition of America's concern for the welfare of the peoples of the captive nations by proclaiming July 14-20 as Captive Nations Week. The problem of captive nations, of 100 million people subjugated in captivity by the Communists, is a problem that goes beyond a 1-week ceremonial observance. America must demonstrate its moral and political commitment to the independence and freedom of captive nations 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is a constructive means of dealing with this vital problem on a year-round basis.

The debate on the various provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 today has made it abundantly clear that the United States is at a critical point as a leader in the great struggle for freedom. The need for a captive nations committee is greater today than ever before in our history. The free world must face squarely the fact that we must deal with the insistent expansionist aims of Communist China, the increasing oppressive and hostile activities of the Kremlin Communists, the continuing crisis in Laos and Vietnam, and the unfinished business in Latin America and in Africa. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is both a

practical and inspirational approach in our efforts to gain self-determination for the victims of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and with the proponents of freedom everywhere in supporting the desire for freedom and liberty which continues to burn in the hearts of the peoples of the captive nations.

We, in the United States are fortunate to be living in a country founded upon principles of human dignity and representative government. There are, regrettably, those who are not so blessed. The friends and relatives of hundreds of my Pittsburgh constituents still live under the militarily supported rule of Soviet imperialism. It is a rule that denies the existence of fundamental human concepts of freedom and dignity.

Emancipation of these captive peoples is our ultimate goal. Our weapons in this effort are many: ideological, psychological, political, economic, and diplomatic—a flexibility calculated to meet every subtle change in the Communist power structure. It is imperative that, in our desire to achieve eventual liberation of these Soviet colonies, we leave no avenue of approach unexplored.

Encouraging successes in this area have already been noted but complacency is by no means indicated. The erosion of the ideological wall of solidarity, coupled with internal economic pressures, has brought about a gradual relaxation of autocracy. This, however, represents an expedient concession by the Communists rather than recognition of inherent individual rights.

It is therefore singularly appropriate that, acting through their freely elected representatives, the people of the United States continue to expose Soviet colonialism to freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and many of my colleagues who have spoken on this decision, in urging the prompt creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I hope and pray that this session will not adjourn until the special committee for which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania so long has worked has been authorized.

I venture the prediction that if the resolution creating this special committee is brought to the floor of the House, it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

This is the time in the long struggle of the free world against the evil forces of communism that we should give strong and positive reassurance to the millions of men, women, and children in the captive nations that they are now, and shall continue to be, in the subject of our interest and our determination to strive for this liberation with no faltering in our effort.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following be permitted to revise and extend their remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]: Mr. SHORT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. KING, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, ED DERWINSKI, and others in our joint efforts to bring to the attention of our colleagues the imperative need for the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee. Now, perhaps at this time more than any other, it would be more meaningful to create such a committee in the House of Representatives.

Take the nuclear test ban treaty entered into with the Soviet Union. This could be the beginning of a more peaceful world. It could also mean we are walking in a camouflaged trap, and it would just be another instance of the Communists favorite doubledealing game—talking sweetness and light out of one side of their mouth, and on the other side, planning all manner and means of duplicity.

Russia could prove good faith in the test ban agreement by freeing these captive nations. She should be put to this test. Perhaps I am unduly suspicious of the motive of any Communist. However, it seems that experience has taught us we must be wary. Remember, the Soviet Union has broken almost every agreement since 1945. This would seem to appear that an agreement with them would be worth little more than the paper it was written on. Remember, also, the tests Mr. Khrushchev is agreeing to ban are those we can detect anyway. Remember, that immediately upon the signing of the test ban agreement, the Russians continued pressing hard for consideration of a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. Such a treaty would be a farce and only an attempt to drive a wedge between the United States and Western European countries.

I think when we weigh all the factors, we are justified in taking the risk, and the Senate should ratify the treaty. Let us not, however, be lulled into a dream-world—thinking that we have now assured peace in the world. Let us not think that the Communists have suddenly changed their spots. To me, the Soviet Union could have assured the world of its good faith by removing troops and arms from Cuba, opening the Berlin wall, or taking steps to extend more freedom to the captive nations.

Since Mr. Khrushchev did not choose to do any of these things, I feel we must continue to ask ourselves whether or not the Soviet Union is only using this outward expression of peace to cover her efforts to expand the Communist ideology throughout the world.

An expression of the reservations we have in our minds would be such a committee as some 40 or more Members of the House are urging. Let the Communist world know we are not pawns and dupes—that we have no intention of acquiescing to the Communist empire—that we take seriously the God-given rights and privileges of all people for freedom—to govern themselves as they see fit—not to be run roughshod over by a power-hungry colonial thirsting Communist empire.

I say to each Member of the House that I would urge they seriously consider this proposed legislation of ours—proposed, I might add, on a completely bipartisan basis, and support this move for the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee, as would be provided in my House Resolution 184, and some 40 others, now pending before the Rules Committee.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to express my appreciation to my two distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], for reserving this time and arranging this bipartisan effort to focus attention on the resolutions now before the Rules Committee to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House.

One of my first official acts as a Member of Congress was to introduce House Resolution 175 calling for the establishment of such a special committee. At the time, I urged that we who legislate in an atmosphere of freedom be ever mindful that the benefits of this noble democratic practice are denied millions of the world's peoples enslaved by communism.

I also urged that we seize every possible opportunity to remind the world of the plight of the captive nations and the Soviet perfidy which has brought it about. Through the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the forum of the United Nations, and the creation of this special House committee, we can and must assume leadership in exposing the hoax of world communism. We need to effect greater measures in all of these areas in order to assure the brave people of the captive nations that they are not forgotten, that we are working and praying for the day when they will once more walk in the sunlight of freedom.

My home community of Rochester, N.Y., derives much of its greatness from the talents, energies and unique attributes of those whose homelands or ancestral lands are now captive nations.

I speak for my constituents, therefore, in saying that we now have an opportunity to put into action our words and feelings. Let us now implement the desires we have expressed so often in the past to see constructive action taken to hasten the return of freedom and self-determination to the people of the captive nations.

The establishment of this special committee will serve as a working symbol of our fundamental conviction that the central issue of our time is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom. Assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truth and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of the captive nations can prove the validity of this conviction.

Through the creation of such a committee, the tools of truth can be put to most effective use against the deceit of communism.

Moscow has shown a profound fear of the mounting concern displayed in the free world for the captive nations. The committee I propose can advance this concern and further work to explode the myths of Soviet unity, Soviet national

economic strides, and Soviet military prowess which have been foisted on the people of the captive nations.

Let us make the best use of this fear. Let us establish this committee and put some teeth in our good intentions. Let us be able to announce that we have taken positive action, that the United States intends to achieve victory in this intense psychological struggle.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to give my support to the proposed Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for their leadership in this area. They deserve the thanks of the House for their continued display of concern and energy in this matter. I am proud to be associated with them in this effort to secure approval of this proposal.

There are alarming things going on which cause much dismay among the Americans whose heritage is behind the Iron Curtain. It is a source of great concern to these people that there is discussion of the possibility that arrangements will be made which would seem to place our national policy in a position of endorsing the Communist regimes in the captive nations.

Certainly Members of the House share this concern. Many of us believe that the time is ripe, when some say that Soviet Russia is trying—for its own reasons—to establish a rapport with this country, to call the Soviet bluff. If there is any sincerity in the smiling face which the Russian bear now turns to the west, and I seriously doubt that there is, then let us in this body call the bluff.

Let us call renewed world attention to the fact that this Russian empire consists of nations which were formerly independent and autonomous, taken by armed force or subversion, in violation of treaty and solemn agreement. If the Russian colonialists want to be sincere in their so-called thaw in the cold war, as some would have us believe, then let them show their sincerity by removing their troops, commissars, secret police, and lackeys from the captive nations. Let them return millions of deported citizens, or so many of them as have survived the concentration camps where they have languished without benefit of trial, and finally let there be free elections between candidates of the people's choosing.

These things are the proper concern of this Nation. We have a long policy of recognizing governments which are freely chosen by the majority of people in any country, or even governments which we believe truly represent the majority opinion in a country. This is a noble tradition, and it is one which we should continue.

But how can we continue this fine custom and at the same time be considering full diplomatic relations with Hungary? This is reported to be under active consideration by diplomatic circles in this country. If such a thing is done, it will be done in the face of strong congressional opposition, for both this body and the other body have heard many speeches on this subject, and to

my recollection not one representative of the people of this country has spoken in favor of moving one inch toward recognition of the Communist regime in Hungary.

I believe a recent Associated Press article in the Omaha World-Herald of August 9 is pertinent to this discussion and include it now:

U.S. ACCORD FOR HUNGARY?

WASHINGTON.—There is a firm belief in diplomatic circles that the United States and Communist Hungary will resume full diplomatic relations, probably by the end of this summer.

The belief persists despite State Department denials.

Relations between the two sank to a low point in 1956 after Russian troops crushed the Hungarian revolt.

The American Minister, Edward T. Waller, refused to present his credentials to the Russian-backed government. Since then, a chargé d'affaires has headed the U.S. Legation.

About 6 months ago, in informal conversations, the United States made known it expects the Budapest regime to give tangible evidence of its willingness to end the rigid climate.

The Kadar government proclaimed an amnesty for political prisoners. Last month it lifted travel restrictions that had limited the movement of American diplomats.

Although Washington has not responded with an end to similar restrictions on Hungarian diplomats, there have been hints that the United States is preparing some sort of "package deal."

The State Department already has said that contacts with the Kadar government were established through the U.S. Legation in Budapest, aimed at what is called normalization of relations.

A crucial question is the future of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Hungarian Roman Catholic primate who has been living in self-imposed exile in the U.S. Legation since the uprising.

Cardinal Mindszenty was not included in the amnesty.

If there is truth in this report, and I believe there is, then let it be said that the plans to move toward full diplomatic relations with this Communist regime do not have the support of the Congress, the people, or our own historic policy in determining what government we should recognize.

I believe it is important and necessary for this body to set up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I believe it is important because the millions of people in these captive nations deserve our best support. I believe it is important because such a committee would speak for the people of this country in a way which I regret to say some of our diplomatic personnel do not do.

I strongly urge the adoption of the resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I am pleased to serve with other Members of this body as a cosponsor.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD, and my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DERWINSKI, on their stimulating efforts to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As one of the sponsors of the resolution on behalf of the captive nations, I strongly share the concern of my colleagues for the people of the cap-

tive nations behind the Iron Curtain. These resolutions symbolize the will to recover freedom and solidarity of all captive nations throughout the world.

In this age of international tension when the Western nations have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world, it is only proper that we in the United States insist that the Soviet Union likewise grant freedom and independence to the people of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other captive nations. We in this country cannot be indifferent to these people whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose prestige among the nations of the world is being denied.

Before we agree to a test ban treaty or even negotiate with Khrushchev we should first demand freedom for those people behind the Iron Curtain or at least freedom of choice.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in urging the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members have expressed to me lately their concern over an article which appeared in a recent issue of Life magazine. That article, you may recall, charged the Congress with throwing away billions of dollars on pet projects that would assure individual Congressmen the support of their constituents. Quite frankly, I am not surprised any more by this type of criticism. There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of some members of the press and some individuals to undermine the institutions of Government which have made our country the greatest in the world. To those frustrated persons—and I do not refer here to the Life reporters—I can only express pity. They do the devil's work—and Moscow's too, I am afraid, albeit unknowingly.

I would, however, like to review for a moment the Post Office Department program which was criticized in the Life article. It was this part of the article that caused Members to express their concern to me as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee which acts originally on the Post Office Department's budget request. While my subcommittee does not appropriate funds for the construction of post offices—this is done through the

General Services Administration—we do consider the Department's lease-building program which the article criticizes.

Under this program the Department leases necessary facilities instead of asking the GSA to build them. This policy is thoroughly in keeping with the American free enterprise system of private versus Government ownership. Let me say immediately that on the question of basic cost, the leasing arrangement is somewhat more expensive, as maintained in the article under discussion. Over a long period of years, it is basically cheaper to build than it is to rent, particularly if the facility can be turned over profitably when it is no longer needed.

But since 1888 the Post Office Department has had the authority to lease necessary space on a year-to-year basis and there are good reasons for such a program. In the first place, a lease naturally gives the Department more flexibility in the placement of post offices in locations where they can best provide the service called for in our Constitution.

These leases are arranged on a competitive basis. Bids are asked and an award is made. The U.S. Post Office, of course, is the largest business in the world. It does an annual business of approximately \$5 billion. It should, therefore, employ the best of business methods and I would point out, in this regard, that a leasing policy is followed by most of our large commercial chain-stores. They usually do not buy local sites; they lease and pay rent.

Our population is growing and moving, particularly from the cities to the suburbs, and the Post Office Department has found that many of its old offices are inadequate in terms of space or obsolete in terms of the service they must provide. The leasing arrangement has made it possible for the Department to move to a more advantageous spot without having a useless building on its hands.

In addition to the population factor, there is also a transportation factor to be considered. Many old offices are no longer adequate because they do not have the space necessary to handle the trucks and other mail vehicles used by the service today to provide speedier delivery.

Just a few weeks ago I took part in the dedication of a new branch office in my congressional district. It was necessary to move the station just a few blocks away, in the same shopping area in fact, because the old building was not large enough to handle the mail load and did not have the parking and maneuvering space to handle the mail vehicles.

The proper approach, of course, is for the Department to buy or build those facilities for which a permanent requirement exists. This applies particularly to stable downtown areas in large cities. Where the office may not be permanent, because of the shifting population or for other reasons, the leasing program offers a desirable alternative.

The Department now rents or leases nearly 25,000 facilities. More than 15,000 of them are rented on a month-to-month basis. About 9,000 facilities are occupied on a fixed-term basis, more than 90 percent of which are for terms of less than 10 years, although the article

we are discussing dealt only with 30-year leases. So you do have flexibility which is so often necessary.

Moreover, the leasing program involves a taxation factor which ought to be considered in any comparison of cost, although here again the magazine article overlooked it. When a building is leased to the Federal Government, its owner, the lessor, must pay local real estate taxes on the property and income taxes. Where the building is owned by the Federal Government, of course, the property is exempt from taxation and the locality is required to provide police and fire protection and local services without compensation.

In fact, taxes and a fair return on capital investment account almost entirely for the difference in cost referred to in the Life article.

In this discussion, I hope that I have helped some of the Members understand the situation more clearly. I am sure there are abuses in the system and we are looking for them everyday. I am sure the program costs too much, and that is the main reason why this body voted a substantial cut in the Post Office budget for 1964.

But there are two sides to nearly every charge, and I feel all of the facts should be presented.

TO PROHIBIT AN AMERICAN TASS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am preparing legislation to stop the newly created market wire service of the Department of Agriculture. Unless we halt this first step toward a gigantic Government-owned news service, we may wind up with an American Tass.

My bill bars the Federal Government from owning or leasing wire services in competition with private news systems.

News wire service providing farm market news was put into operation August 1 by the Department. While it is available to any newspaper or person on request, the Secretary of Agriculture can cancel subscribers who "abuse" the service.

Unfairly competing with existing private news services, this Government news network is an ominous example of political intrusion into both freedom of the press and free enterprise.

Government-run wire services could drive existing private firms out of business. Privately owned wires cannot charge their expenses to the taxpayer. Once again the Government bites off a chunk of private enterprise.

Forced bankruptcy of AP, UPI, and other wire services from a competing Government news service would mean the end of the free press. If the Government can dominate news distribution, it can cut off and ruin newspapers and radio-TV stations which criticize the powers that be.

In 3 years in Congress, I have never had a single request that the Government get into the news business.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are no clear-cut answers to the problems facing the world and foreign aid, as we consider it today in terms of dollars and cents, is no exception.

In thinking back to what our country has done in the past as far as assistance to less fortunate countries is concerned, I do not think there is a person in the world who can justifiably criticize the United States of America. The assistance that was given the war-ravaged nations of the world at the close of World War II and since has been unparalleled. However, despite all of the aid that has been given, the prestige of the United States abroad is actually not as high as it was before foreign assistance was started.

Today we meet, as we have done for the past 19 years for the purpose of extending for 1 more year, our hand of good will to the so-called less fortunate nations of the world.

My questions to this august body are: Can we afford to spend this amount of money? Are we so rich? Is our financial condition so solvent that we can continue to spend this money abroad without affecting our already serious balance-of-payments problem? Gentlemen, the answers to these questions are quite obvious to me. I honestly do not think that as a nation we can afford to saddle our economy with this \$4.5 billion burden.

For a world at the close of World War II that found two-thirds of its people hungry and lacking in industrial potential, the people of the United States responded most generously.

This expression of good will undoubtedly will go down in history as one of the most worthwhile undertakings, for mankind's sake, of this century.

Our moral obligations toward helping with the post-World War II reconstruction were met, and for this I am thankful. However, I question our ability as a nation overburdened with confiscatory tax rates and deficit spending to be in a position to continue the foreign assistance program.

Our own people deserve as much consideration, and more, as we have given the rest of the world. There are obligations in this country which we must assume if we are to continue to remain the leader of the free world.

TIME TO CLEAN HOUSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of WILLIAM E. MILLER, chairman of the Republican National Committee. Chairman MILLER's statement is self-explanatory, and we will now await with great interest to see what Democratic National Chairman John Bailey has to say about the matter. He cannot remain silent on this issue unless he wishes to condone and approve the resolutions recently adopted by the Young Democrats of 13 Western States in Berkeley, Calif.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN WILLIAM E. MILLER
Democratic National Chairman John Bailey owes the American people an explanation for some resolutions recently adopted by the Young Democrats of 13 Western States in Berkeley, Calif. To what extent did the "radical left" not only attend but obviously control, this convention, so that the following resolutions, among others, were adopted?

1. U.S. resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba.
2. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations.
3. U.S. withdrawal of its troops from South Vietnam.

What were the motives and policies of a group seeking United States-Cuban diplomatic relations less than 10 days after Castro's kidnapping of Cuban refugees? What arguments so swayed the delegates that they supported a resolution which would seriously weaken NATO? Who convinced the Young Democrats that we should withdraw from South Vietnam and leave it open to the Communists?

These resolutions should be immediately and openly disavowed by responsible Democrats. It is up to Mr. Bailey to break the embarrassed silence in his party since the issuance of the Young Democrats' resolutions.

It is he who has recently been taking the opportunity to charge that the Republican Party is in danger of being taken over and controlled by the radical right. These charges are never substantiated. There is not one Republican policy statement, resolution or platform plank to be cited as proof. In contrast, Mr. Bailey remains silent when confronted with the radical left in his own party.

Queries as to the large number of ADA members holding high administration positions have always gone unanswered. This organization has a basic contempt for our traditions of free enterprise and individual liberty. It is its announced aim to tailor our Constitution to fit its peculiar measurement of a socialist welfare state.

The ADA would grant full diplomatic recognition to the butchers of Red China. Like the Young Democrats at Berkeley, it would knock down the legal barriers which now hinder the free play of Soviet subversion and espionage in this country.

Chairman Bailey makes the broad and unsubstantiated generalization that the ultra-right is taking over the Republican Party. He names no names, because there is not a single member of the Birch Society or any other ultraconservative group in a position of influence in our party structure.

On the other hand, I can name names, and I will.

In the President's Cabinet there is Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman of the radical left ADA. On the White House staff

are ADA members Theodore Sorensen, Lawrence O'Brien, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

In the State Department are found Chester Bowles, Averell Harriman, "Soapy" Williams, and Carl Rowan.

The Under Secretaries of three Government Departments are ADA men: Ivan Nestingen of Health, Education, and Welfare; Charles Murphy of Agriculture; and Henry Fowler, of the Treasury Department.

Assistant Secretary of Labor George Weaver and Assistant Postmaster General Frederick Belen are on the list. Also the U.S. Solicitor General, Archibald Cox. There are others in key positions, not to mention uncounseled underlings and flunkies.

The Democratic side of the Senate is literally crawling with members of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the House of Representatives has a liberal quota.

However, I know of not a single John Birch or radical rightist among Republicans in the Congress, among our Republican Governors, or among our State Chairmen and members of the National Committee.

I would urge Democratic leaders promptly to repudiate the resolutions adopted at the Young Democrats meeting, and then to take steps to reassure the American people by purging from high office the radical left from the Democratic Party and administration.

TEST BAN "SECRET SIDE AGREEMENT" CHARGE WITHDRAWN— "RECKLESS AND IMPROVIDENT" CHARGE HURLED FOR FAILURE TO MAKE ONE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I charged that there must be a secret side agreement with Russia as to what the published text of the partial test ban treaty actually means. This charge was based on the glib, ready, and positive statements of administration officials as to the exact meanings of various provisions of the pact. Particular reference was made to the claim it does not bar the use of nuclear weapons in war.

I stated:

No one familiar with Russian tactics in twisting treaty terms could make such statements with assurance unless detailed interpretations had been hammered out with the Russians beforehand and put down in black and white.

My statement, reprinted at page A5249 of the daily RECORD, added:

As a practical matter, it would be reckless and improvident to conclude a treaty with the Soviets without doing so.

On Tuesday the following exchange occurred between a newsman and the President during the latter's press conference:

Question. The ranking House Republican expert on atomic energy says that in spite of all administration denials, he is sure that there was a side agreement at Moscow. Is there some way you can present any proof positive?

Answer. No, I cannot. There is nothing I can say other than to say it is not so. The

Undersecretary of State can't say other than that it isn't so. There is nothing Governor Harriman can say than it isn't so. There is nothing the Prime Minister of England can say, who participated in it, Lord Hailsham, Lord Home, except that it isn't so. No, we can't prove it.

I accept the President's clear denial that there was any side agreement as to what the treaty's published text means. I therefore withdraw my charge that such an agreement exists. I stipulate that it does not exist.

However, under the circumstances I must reiterate and renew my charge that the failure to have made such an agreement, secret or otherwise, as to the meaning of the treaty's words is both reckless and improvident. This failure inevitably will lead to deep and serious trouble for the United States. It is a grave blunder in carrying on our foreign policy.

Time and again this failure to come to agreement at the time a treaty is made has led to trouble. It was the imprecision in World War II agreements which led to the original Berlin crisis, the long airlift, and subsequent recurring Berlin crises. Failure to define "inspection" and other terms of the Korean armistice has brought on agonizing problems. Loose wording in the non-aggression pacts between the Soviet Union and Latvia and Estonia and other states allowed the Kremlin to place its own definition on "aggression," charge that it had occurred, abrogate the treaties on the flimsy basis of the charge and invade those countries. Everyone recognizes that the failure to define the word "neutrality" in the Austrian treaty hangs like a sword of Damocles over the peace of central Europe.

Now the test ban pact, without the side agreement, presents more opportunities to the Kremlin for the same devilish mischief. It is a sloppily written document, its legal terms are ill-defined and the possibilities for varying and conflicting interpretations by the parties is vast. The language of article I, for example, was found so disturbingly imprecise on reexamination by the State Departments that it raised the question of whether, as written, the treaty did not actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in case of war. The ambiguity led President Kennedy to include a statement in his radio-TV speech of July 26 alleging the treaty "will not restrict" the use of nuclear weapons in time of war.

Already the Red army's official newspaper, "Red Star," has voiced complaint over this interpretation.

It is plain to see that all the Russians need say to any meaning we give the treaty's language is "nyet!" and chaos will follow.

No definition that is agreed upon as to the word "war," as it might be taken in context of the treaty, exists. None exists defining "limited war," "guerrilla action," or "police action," such as was the case of Korea. Other examples of undefined and ambiguous words and phrases pertaining to the treaty and subject to varying definitions are: "tests,"

"nuclear weapons," "explosion," "outer space" and "territorial waters."

This imprecision can lead to the same troubles, the same difficulties, the same losses of prestige and territory that before have arisen from the failure of our negotiators to insist upon precise and clear definitions of what are meant by the words and phrases found in such documents whenever Communists are signatories.

It is incredible, after all the dismal experiences of the past, that U.S. negotiators again have led us into this treacherous kind of semantics minefield which allows the Soviets the freedom to define what a treaty means in accordance with what is best for them, and to tear up the treaty if we fail to agree.

I repeat, it has been an inexcusably reckless and improvident act to speed us into this treaty without taking the precaution to hammer out in black and white what it means and nailing the Kremlin down to that definition.

It is to be noted that this difficulty with the treaty—the lack of a side agreement of definition—has not heretofore received any public discussion at all. I regard it as a matter of vast importance at which specific and detailed attention should be directed by the other body during its deliberations on ratification.

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL'S LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE MOSCOW TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American Security Council in its Washington Report published a significant study of the partial test ban treaty as a legal document. The study was prepared by an eminently qualified and respected international lawyer, Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former associate professor of law at George Washington University and former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy from 1956 until 1960. The study, which should contribute much to an understanding of this pact, is as follows:

LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE MOSCOW TEST-BAN TREATY

(By Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired)

More than half—almost 2 out of 3—U.S. Senators are lawyers.

From this prosaic circumstance rises the possibility that the Test Ban Treaty will not be ratified by the Senate.

For the Moscow Treaty, viewed as a legal instrument, is a monstrosity. Even State Department sources have observed that some of its important language is "disturbingly imprecise." Such an expression, when used by high levels in State, in describing language approved by the Under Secretary of State, amounts practically to swear words. It's a wonder the New York Times published the expression—as it did in a special Washington dispatch dated July 26. Even con-

strued in that strong a sense, however, the use of the expression "disturbingly imprecise" to describe the legally fantastic provisions of the Moscow Treaty constitutes the understatement of the century.

The Moscow Treaty is shot through with loopholes, two-faced double-acting jokers, and triple-threat exit provisions. It is almost as great an insult to our national intelligence as it is a threat to our national security.

The United States is entering a legalistic trap. The danger is in the document. This legal instrument was drawn with superb skill in duplicity by the Soviet negotiators. The Soviet draftsmanship was accepted with incredible gullibility by the U.S. representatives. As a result, the Soviet promises in the treaty are illusory. Senate ratification will therefore give to them valid U.S. promises, which will bind us, in return for worthless Soviet promises, which will not bind them.

To evaluate the Moscow treaty as a legal monstrosity is not a matter of individual opinion, as to which reasonable persons might differ. Objective—almost mechanical—application of accepted professional legal standards will expose gross and dangerous legal defects. These legal defects could easily have been avoided before initiating by the U.S. negotiators. They subject the United States to quite unnecessary and serious risks. They so unfairly advantage the Soviets that they can undermine the power balance necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

This report will present a summary and analysis of only the five most obviously dangerous legal defects in the treaty. (Many others will be obvious to any attorney.) Each will be established by the incontrovertible proof of direct quotation from the official wording of the treaty itself. Each one will unnecessarily prejudice the interests of the United States if the Senate ratifies this particular test ban treaty.

This point reveals another reason—in addition to their capability of making their own legal analysis of the treaty and its inherent defects—why the fact that so many Senators are lawyers, may bring about the surprise upset of the unprecedented bandwagon campaign for ratification. This second reason deserves consideration before examining the specifics of the legal defects in the treaty, because it will make clear why it is the constitutional duty of each Senator—and in the interest of all Americans—to become familiar with the dangers unnecessarily thrust on the United States by this particular test ban treaty.

Our Senators, and especially those who are lawyers, understand that the issue before them is not whether they are against risking nuclear incineration of 300,000,000 people, including Americans. They know the true issue is instead, whether this Moscow test ban treaty is really "an important first step" away from nuclear incineration—or a long leap toward it.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made a forceful statement of this thesis in an article published in the New York Times on August 3. He conceded that the Senate will "ratify a test ban agreement that proves, after careful study to be in the national interest," but, he cautioned,

"Before reaching such a determination, the Senate, to fulfill its Constitutional obligations, must look at any agreement with the greatest care, to make sure that the possible gains are not overshadowed by the risks that are inevitably run."

If that majority group of Senator-lawyers does indeed look at this agreement "with the greatest care," the resulting debate will be

far more sensationally historic than President Kennedy ever intended. Senator Jackson's forthright declaration proves that the really knowledgeable Senators understand that their constitutional duty is to ask not what this treaty can do as a step toward a victory for mankind; but to ask what this treaty will do toward the defeat of the United States.

Answers are found in each of the five major defects in the Moscow treaty.

With the usual type of "joker," discovery thereof prior to the document's becoming binding, permits removing it at no cost to the injured party. With the new Soviet type, we are already trapped. If the Senate accepts the present language, the Soviets can administer a military defeat; if we try to change the clear meaning of the language, the Soviets can administer a vicious propaganda defeat. The trap is set in article I:

"1. Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

"A. In the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or under water, including territorial waters or high seas; or"

"2. Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described."

This is some of the language euphemistically described by the State Department as "disturbingly imprecise." The New York Times special Washington dispatch of July 26, reports this additional understatement from its sources in State:

"Article I, for instance, raised the question of whether the treaty, as written, did not actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in case of war."

The first legal defect of the treaty is that by clear and unambiguous language, it does indeed "actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in time of war." This interpretation is shrewdly reinforced by declaration in the preamble of the "principal aim" of the parties to "eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons," and to "put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances."

On the Soviet's part, this language is in no way accidental or inadvertent. The test ban and the ban on the use of nuclear weapons were established as priority targets of the world Communist movement as a Party Congress in Moscow in 1955, when 65 national Communist Parties signed a manifesto on the subject. They have made constant efforts to get our signature on such an agreement. Now they have it. Always heretofore we had insisted that a ban against use expressly permit use "against aggression." They, of course, were never willing to allow such a deterrent to aggression.

Thus if the Senate ratifies the Moscow treaty without a reservation to an understanding imposed to get us out of the military trap, and if we intend to comply with the clear terms of the treaty, we will be in effect betraying our NATO Allies, and turning over all of Europe and Asia to the Communists. The Soviets have 174 divisions to our 16; and theirs have four times as much as ours in modern conventional weapons. Ever since the United States unilaterally disarmed at the end of World War II, only our massive nuclear first-strike capability has deterred the Soviets from overrunning first Europe, and then the world.

When State Department officials got their first shocking glimpse of the Soviet ban on use joker, they initiated frenzied action to attempt to blunt the effect of the Soviet

trick. The official text of the President's test ban address to the Nation had been distributed to the press, but the President had not yet delivered it over TV and radio. State therefore abandoned its original plan of issuing a "special U.S. statement of clarification." This would have revealed Soviet duplicity and U.S. naivete to the entire country. Instead, they made a last-minute change in the President's speech, to have him say that the treaty "will not restrict their [nuclear weapons'] use in time of war."

This was not even a good try at digging us out of the legal trap. Such a unilateral statement might be admissible to explain an ambiguity in a treaty, but cannot be allowed to contradict a treaty's clear terms. Thus Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller recommended the only safe legal step to escape the ban against use. In a statement quoted by UPI on August 11, he called for attachment by the Senate of an "understanding" that the treaty does not prohibit the use of nuclear weapons to repel aggression.

The Senate is accustomed to imposing such "understandings" or "reservations" in about 18 percent of the treaties submitted. In this case, however, if the Senate does what is needed, it will expose us to the most vicious worldwide propaganda campaign the Communists can devise. We will have proved, they could claim, that we intend to unleash a hydrogen holocaust on the world; that we insist on keeping "the peoples of the world" in terrible fear of nuclear destruction; that the capitalist warmongers are revealed in their true colors—and that the peace-loving Soviet Union was willing to make this great sacrifice of giving up use of their tremendously more powerful nuclear weapons, but not so the United States.

The second legal defect in the treaty is the extension of the use-ban "joke" by the language of paragraph 2, to bind the United States not to share with our allies the weapons our mutual enemy has in such abundance. An agreement not to assist our allies in making nuclear tests would have been a reasonable supplement to our own agreement not to test in prohibited environments. Repetition of the joker phrase, however, carries the obligation much further than tests, and prohibits us from "in any way participating in" the carrying out of "any other nuclear explosion, anywhere." Furnishing weapons to be exploded would clearly come within that prohibition.

To a future U.S. administration, it might become clear that the national self-preservation of the United States depends upon sharing with our allies. Multiplication of the targets a surprise attack must hit to save the Soviet Union from retaliatory devastation, may be recognized as an essential element of deterring a surprise attack. Now, of course, we refuse to share with our friends, even on a basis which would make us, and them, and the peace of the world more secure. But now this is a matter of policy only. Senate ratification, without a "reservation" or an appended "understanding," will put us in a straitjacket of treaty obligation. On the other hand, if we try to exit the trap, we will be vulnerable to Soviet propaganda that we demand to sow worldwide the seeds of nuclear terror and destruction, and are plotting against Soviet measures to preserve the peace.

The third legal defect is also included in article I. This is not another case of the U.S. representatives approving language squarely contrary to U.S. intent. This language is merely ambiguous, but still below any reasonable standard of professional competence. The New York Times article quoted above reports its Washington source appraisal of this defect:

"Article I also contains another passage that contradicts U.S. policy and a United Nations resolution on the limits of national jurisdiction over the atmosphere and space.

The world organization stated unanimously in 1961 that space was free for exploration and not subject to national appropriation.

"The test ban treaty, however, could be read as implying that the atmosphere and regions beyond its limits, including space, are places under the jurisdiction or control of nations."

This may not appear now to be an important point, but if the United States continues present policy of refusing to compete with Russia in developing capabilities for the military use of space (see the highly authoritative article in Reader's Digest for August 1963, entitled "We're Running the Wrong Race With Russia") it may become the only legal peg the Soviets require for both de jure and de facto control of space. They may shoot down our defensive early-warning satellites and block our other essential space activities. Freedom of space may soon be more important to U.S. survival than was ever our great tradition of freedom of the seas. Because we are an open society, we need space reconnaissance to help offset the military advantages of their closed society. Because we are a have-not nation as to land mass, we need the vast depth of space to offset their 9 million square miles over our 3,700,000.

The overriding legal questions of life-or-death importance to the United States are those raised by a single assertion in President Kennedy's address to the Nation on the Moscow test ban treaty:

"For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation."

Does this treaty really obligate the Soviet Union to do anything? Or to refrain from doing anything? If so, to what does it solemnly obligate Russia? And for how long? If Russia is obligated, are there any provisions to determine whether she is meeting her obligations? If it should be proved that she has violated her obligations, are there any enforcement provisions to secure compliance? Are there any penalty provisions to deter cheating in advance—or to punish it if it is detected and proved?

All of these questions strike at the heart of the two most serious legal defects in the Moscow Treaty.

The fourth and fifth legal defects are, therefore, fourth, that there are no inspection provisions, no control provisions, no penalty provisions, no enforcement provisions; and, fifth, the Soviet-demanded "escape clause" provides great advantages for the Soviets, rewards rather than retards their most probable types of test ban betrayal, and puts the United States at the greatest possible disadvantage.

The least that this Nation and its Senate should demand of the Moscow test ban treaty is more adequate safeguards against betrayal by the Soviets than existed under the first nuclear test moratorium. Trusting Khrushchev's thrice-repeated promises in that arrangement, resulted in a disaster so shocking that its magnitude is still not understood by the American people.

By his first ban-breaking series of tests, Khrushchev advanced his technology sufficiently to multiply the explosive power of his strategic weapons stockpile by 500 percent. He secured the addition of enough nuclear explosive power to destroy the United States, all of our allies, and should he desire, Red China, at the same time. It gave him the capability of building operational missiles up to 100 times more powerful than the U.S. most modern and numerous missiles, Polaris and Minuteman. By making and betraying the first test ban, Khrushchev not only stole our long existing two-to-one superiority in the technology of strategic nuclear warheads—he more than reversed it.

There are other cogent reasons why the Senator-lawyers should reject or ratify the Moscow Treaty, depending on their findings

as to whether its safeguards are at least superior to those of the first moratorium.

President Kennedy himself has expressed this conviction with logic that cannot be challenged. If other nations, he said, in 1962, "thought we could permit a repetition of last summer's deception surely they would lose faith in our will and wisdom as well as our weaponry" (Newsweek, Mar. 12, 1962).

What happens when the Soviets form a low opinion of our "will and wisdom," is demonstrated by their attempt to render us vulnerable to a surprise attack spearheaded by no-warning missiles from Cuba.

It does not take a legally trained Senator to determine by reading the text of the treaty that it provides absolutely no safeguards of any kind whatsoever. This determination immediately raises three other questions: Are any safeguards required to protect U.S. security? What type of safeguard is most vital? And can the United States take action outside of the treaty, which will make up for the fact that there are no safeguards in the treaty?

President Kennedy himself has given by far the most convincing answers to these questions. True, his most recent statements have contradicted these answers—but legally trained Senators should have little difficulty in deciding which are the more reliable of the conflicting statements. Knowledgeable Senators, like Senator JACKSON, who was quoted above, have already observed that "A test-ban must not be merchandised like cosmetics * * * Government officials are not salesmen but stewards." Here are the key statements made by Mr. Kennedy before the "hard sell" began.

In November 1961, President Kennedy denounced the Soviets prolonged preparations to betray the test ban while going through the motions of "negotiations" with us. He declared that "if they fooled us once, it is their fault, and if they fool us twice, it is our fault."

In January of 1962, he stressed specifically the danger of Soviet betrayal of a second test ban by secret preparations for surprise atmospheric tests. He declared that any future agreement would have to contain "methods of inspection and control which could protect us against a repetition of prolonged secret preparations for a sudden series of major tests."

On March 14, 1962, at his press conference, the President again stated that "We are going to make proposals in regard to inspection of preparations."

Yet the Moscow Treaty has absolutely no such inspection or control provisions as the President himself declared are necessary to protect U.S. security against Soviet "surprise" abrogation.

The likelihood of such a betrayal is now enhanced by the Moscow Treaty "escape clause". As Khrushchev himself repeatedly declared under the 1958 moratorium, the side which violated that moratorium would "cover itself with shame" and "be condemned by the people of the world." The 3-month-notice clause—which broke all U.S. treaty precedents and our tradition of the binding effect of treaties—now provides an honorable way to betray us with a surprise abrogation.

Even the U.S. Disarmament Agency has admitted that 18 months might be required to prepare a comprehensive series of tests, so 3 months is obviously too little notice for security. Also, under article 49-0 of the Soviet Constitution, the Soviet Government is authorized to abrogate any treaty, instantly and without cause.

To cover these facts, and to attempt to explain away the failure of the Treaty to include the safeguards which President Kennedy had declared to be required, a parade of administrator witnesses is claiming that the U.S. will now maintain a "readiness to test."

Secretary of Defense McNamara's testimony on August 13, as reported by the Associated Press on that date, is typical:

"Surprise abrogation does not pose a serious threat to our national security * * * we have the determination to maintain a readiness to test in every environment."

McNamara and most of these witnesses also pontificate that the Soviets could make no substantial gains by one series of pre-planned tests. This, of course, is just what the test ban proponents said last time, up to the point when the Soviets in a single series of tests improved their yield-to-weight ratio by a factor of 5 or more, reversed the former U.S. lead, and began to build massive supremacy into their strategic warheads.

The President has given "steward" rather than "salesman" type answers to both of these contentions. Newsweek under date of March 12, 1962, included this significant statement in the President's explanation of the U.S. "reluctant" determination to resume atmospheric testing:

"Finally, said Mr. Kennedy, the U.S. had no assurance that the Soviet Union would not set off another test series at will, providing the U.S.S.R. 'with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggression.'"

There has not been any scientific development to change the situation since that assertion by the President. Nor does anything in this Treaty preclude the Soviet Union from setting off another test series "at will". They could invoke their constitutional power of instant abrogation, or even give the 3-month notice for an "honorable" exit under their new escape clause.

THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF AMERICA

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Nation's press has become increasingly skeptical about what appears to be a steady and systematic reduction in our military strength. If these articles are true—and the testimony of many of this administration's top experts before committees and subcommittees of this body and the Senate seems to indicate that they are—we soon may find ourselves in a position of complete dependence for our continued survival in freedom upon the goodwill and peaceful intentions of a nation which has a long record of broken agreements.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, find it as difficult as I do to accept the oft-repeated theory that the Communists are "mellowing." We do not believe that their fear of nuclear holocaust has crumbled the very foundation of Marxist philosophy, namely, the victory of world socialism. I cannot believe, as do many supporters of the policies of unilateral disarmament, that the present differences between the Soviet Union and Red China are such as to drive Russia, fearful and shaking, into our outstretched arms for protection from Mao. I say this because I have been unable to find evidence that the Communist Chinese, despite their overpopulation and manpower, are either

capable of or equipped to carry on a war with any of the major nuclear powers, and certainly not with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, or with the United States on the other.

Because of this incontrovertible military fact, most of us are left with a choice of two possible conclusions: First: The Sino-Soviet dispute is but a camouflage to conceal the true and long-known aims of world communism, global conquest, and to lull the West into the false belief that Russia really is not to be feared; or, second, it is, as the principals in the dispute have argued, simply a question of whether peaceful coexistence or war is the best way of burying us. In either case, the controversy is not one which should lead this administration to conclude that Nikita Khrushchev, who personally ordered the massacres in Hungary, the Ukraine, and elsewhere, is today any less of an international criminal than he was then.

Certainly, it may be said that any examination of the past would show that the so-called peaceful coexistence approach to conquest has been more successful than that of armed aggression, but nowhere in the annals of Communist expansion has this "soft line" succeeded without the threat of armed force. The Communists have accomplished their greatest territorial aggrandizement through the medium of negotiations and treaties—Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the rest—but behind all was the spectre of Russian armed might. The basic human fear of war and the tragedy it brings into our lives was exploited to the fullest. Perhaps the most graphic example of this technique is Cuba, where Soviet missiles were introduced and then ostensibly withdrawn as the price for the perpetuation and strengthening of a Communist base a few miles from our shores. There followed also the granting of Khrushchev's demands for removal of Jupiter missiles in Turkey and Italy, a real and potent threat to his own weapons installations.

I believe it was the great journalist, Arthur Brisbane, who once said that nothing succeeds like success, and the Cuban story is proof of this maxim. Khrushchev got what he wanted, Castro now considers himself safe in his Red sanctuary and we have been talked into cutting back on our own offensive capability.

In the editorials and articles I wish to submit for publication in the Record today, Mr. Speaker, the change of our foreign policy from one of strength to one of weakness can be traced. Here are the comments of writers on many of our leading newspapers criticizing the gradual abandonment of our "first strike" weapons systems, which have been so strongly opposed by the Communist world, in favor of something which is euphemistically described as a policy of "nuclear stalemate." There has not been, as far as I can determine, any corresponding slash in Communist weaponry. While our State Department insists that the historic American policy of negotiation backed by military strength is passé, that it constitutes "gunboat diplomacy," it should be obvious that it

is, nevertheless, as practiced by the Communist world, the most successful policy. They are succeeding in attainment of their historic goals. We, on the other hand, continue to lose.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of this body will study and carefully consider these editorials and articles because what they describe well may lead to the abandonment of freedom. We can halt this trend by reaffirming our dedication to American principles and restoring our air, ground, and naval strength to its former invincible posture.

I am aware that some in this Nation seriously believe that the strengthening of our offensive potential will increase tensions between the East and West and thus threaten world peace. Others, I am sure, will agree with the philosophy expounded to this body 170 years ago by one of the world's greatest soldiers and statesmen, the Father of our Republic, George Washington, who said:

There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be prepared to repel it; if we desire peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

The following articles and editorials, Mr. Speaker, accurately reflect that belief:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 5, 1963]
SOMEWHERE, A TRAP OF FATE—STEP BY STEP INTO DISASTER?

As the people have not been taken into the confidence of this administration and have no idea of the content of the many letters being exchanged with Moscow, no one is in a position to be certain of the course on which the United States seems to be proceeding.

It is like feeling around in the dark.

The search for information once again leads back to the Liberal Papers, which created such a political furor less than a year ago. They will not die. This book, representing the advance thinking of the Liberal Wing of America, contained a series of papers on foreign affairs, and one of the most important advocated a policy of "graduated reciprocation in tension reduction."

This, in ordinary language, means step-by-step reductions in arms and actions. But the key in the argument in the Liberal Papers is in the unilateral nature of these reductions as, "our unilateral acts must be perceived by an opponent (not enemy, mind you) as reducing his external threat."

We take one step; the "opponent" will take one, perhaps not as big a one as we did, but nevertheless a step. Then we take another. Gradually our "opponent" will be reassured we mean him no harm.

One of the early steps advocated by the Liberal Papers was unilateral suspension of nuclear testing.

We go back now to the controversial speech which President Kennedy made at American University. He said two vitally important things: (1) that he would unilaterally suspend testing of nuclear weapons, in the hope the Soviet Union would follow suit, and (2) that both sides in the cold war are "caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle with suspicion on one side breeding suspicion on the other, and new weapons begetting counterweapons."

The article, "Reciprocal Initiative," in the Liberal Papers, raised the point as to how can we halt, and then put into reverse, the tensions of the arms race, thereby creating an atmosphere of mutual trust, and that

"each increment in military power by one side provided the stimulus for intensified efforts by the other."

The President also called on the American people to "reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union," and the Liberal Papers argue that "the Russian bogey has been grossly overdrawn."

This is not to accuse the President of having borrowed from the Liberal Papers. But the common strains of thinking suggest a Presidential adjustment to the policies so long advocated by the American left.

Since our unilateral suspension of nuclear testing presumably led to a Communist reciprocal stepdown in agreeing to sign a partial test ban treaty, will the administration soon take another unilateral step? As a matter of fact, we have been taking some for quite some time. We withdrew rockets from bases in Turkey and Italy.

In calling for a new approach to the Soviet Union, the President remarked that "history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever."

This reasoning suggests that the cold war is a dispute between nations. This could be a terrifying misreading of the world situation. The cold war struggle is not between the United States and Russia but between the free world and the Communist world, between one way of life and another.

It is not a Russian challenge to our civilization but an atheistic Communist challenge. Communism is not national, but international; it knows no borders.

History has not experienced this encounter before. It is a struggle that will determine the future of all men, not just the fate of two nations. By narrowing our view of the great struggle, we are disarming ourselves morally and spiritually—as we also may be doing militarily.

Somewhere the trap of fate will be sprung by an enemy that really understands the struggle.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat,
Aug. 3-4, 1963]
U.S. DISARMING

The U.S. military posture is being sharply altered by the administration. Its final tailoring is a topic of paramount concern to every American, for that posture stands alone between us and a return of the Dark Ages.

The administration is acting on the belief that there is a "nuclear stalemate," a "balance of terror," and "overkill" capacity held by both East and West which make it senseless to continue, or accelerate, the strategic arms race and dangerous to possess or flourish "provocative" weapons.

Following this philosophy, America is dismantling "first-strike" weapons and placing our strategic reliance on powerful missiles—and missiles alone.

We have started unilateral disarmament in many categories.

Defense Secretary McNamara, abetted by his computers, killed the Skybolt missile which was to extend the life of the American and British bomber fleets into the 1970's. When he did so, he doomed the manned bomber.

This is made obvious by subsequent acts. The administration has almost halved the number of B-47's, has halted production of the B-52 and B-58 Hustler, and has frozen in the development stage the RS-70 bomber, an aircraft designed to fly at three times the speed of sound.

This philosophy was apparently behind the decision to remove the 60 Thor rockets from Britain and the 45 Jupiter rockets from Turkey and Italy—following the missile pullback by the Soviets in Cuba.

Signs point to a cut in the number of attack aircraft carriers. The Defense Department has refused to begin production of the

Nike-Zeus antimissile weapon, which has test-killed seven missiles.

Apparently this is a "provocative" weapon, threatening the Soviet deterrent, though Mr. McNamara contends it is not as effective as he would like.

America is on record that we will be militarily "second in space." No new strategic bomber, missile or space-weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's, states the U.S. News & World Report magazine this week.

By abandoning these weapons the American nuclear punch must be drastically reduced by 1970 to a point where we are to rely chiefly on the Minuteman rockets and the Polaris subs.

The Globe-Democrat has fought and will continue to fight this march down the road from nuclear superiority to stalemate or worse; from the awesome variety of weapons envisioned by General Eisenhower to the all-eggs-in-the-missile-basket theory of this administration.

Our opposition is in accord with the overwhelming conviction of the military, including the chiefs of staff.

There is no proof whatever our Soviet enemy has accepted any such stalemate theory. Their test of huge terror weapons shows their scorn of any perpetual balance or equality in weapons.

It is also reliably reported they are spending as much on defensive rockets as on offensive missiles.

Time magazine this week reports that "U.S. intelligence has discovered what may be the world's first operational anti-ICBM system at a huge construction site near Leningrad."

Should we then abandon our big missiles? No weapon is obsolete merely because the enemy has the know-how to defend against it. It is obsolete only when the adversary actually possesses an operational, completely reliable defense.

We run a dangerous, foolhardy chance in declaring our bombers obsolete. The first U-2 was shot down only 3 years back. Is it practical to believe that in so brief a time the Soviets have constructed a nationwide defense against SAC bombers, far more sophisticated, far more elusive?

Of the weapons we are to rely upon after 1970, Gen. Curtis LeMay has stated, not one has been test fired with a nuclear warhead by an operational crew.

How will the vaunted hard sites of the Minuteman rockets stand up under a 100-megaton weapon which the Soviets admittedly can build? The Pentagon does not know.

We may be headed, as one critic put it, toward a "technological Pearl Harbor." There is tremendous peril in unilateral disarmament of any sort in the present world.

[From the Dallas News, Aug. 20, 1963]
U.S. DISARMAMENT—BLUEPRINT FOR SURRENDER?

(By Ken Thompson)

Politicians have a way of getting what they want, and the Kennedy administration is no exception. Its leaders know—perhaps better than any of their predecessors—that the people will swallow in small doses what they will reject in quantity.

The disarmament program of the Kennedy administration is a perfect example of how a radical scheme cannot be sold to Congress or the public in a single package, but can be put over piecemeal.

On April 18, 1962, the United States offered a draft treaty to the Soviets at Geneva. Based upon a U.N. speech by the President 7 months earlier and a State Department pamphlet entitled "Freedom From War," the proposed treaty would have eliminated the Armed Forces of this Nation over a period of 6 to 10 years and replaced them with an all-powerful United Nations "peace force."

There were so many loopholes in that proposed treaty that the Soviets could have marched their armies through them on the road to world conquest. Even if the Reds chose to abide by the principles, the best that could be expected from the outcome would have been an irredeemable loss of American sovereignty and ultimate world government under the U.N.

Millions of Americans were horrified by this radical proposal and there was never a chance that the Senate would have ratified such a treaty. Yet today—16 months after that incredible disarmament plan was laughed out of Geneva—we have traveled a long way down the road toward disarmament which was mapped by its authors. We have already taken many of the steps which they specifically outlined. If anything, we are probably well ahead of schedule on that 6- to 10-year program.

One of the primary requirements of that plan, of course, was a test ban treaty—which we have just signed with the Soviets. Many people may have forgotten that on November 27, 1961, the Soviets proposed a nearly identical treaty calling for a ban on tests in the atmosphere, under water and in space without international controls.

That proposal was flatly rejected by the United States and Britain, and was labeled in an official joint report filed by the two Governments as "an extraordinary step backwards." Today the same plan is called a giant step toward peace or a victory for mankind.

The Soviets, of course, have insisted time and again that they would never sign a test ban pact unless it were part of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. The President tells us that there is nothing hidden beneath the test ban treaty. If this is true, the Soviets have departed from a longstanding demand.

It seems possible, however, that a secret agreement leading toward total disarmament could be lurking beneath the surface. That possibility appears more plausible when you consider the whole series of other measures which have been taken in the past year in the area of arms control.

The April 1962, disarmament scheme called for a gradual reduction of nuclear arms and delivery systems. We have already abandoned the RS-70, are phasing out the B-52 and B-58 and have scrapped the Skybolt.

Production, testing, and research were to be halted under the plan. We have killed the Nike-Zeus program, downgraded the Dyna-Soar and nuclear plane projects, and discontinued development of multimegaton weapons.

Under the original disarmament scheme, production of fissionable material for military purposes was to have been stopped and outer space reserved for peaceful purposes. Just recently we offered to meet the first of these requirements and for some time now we have been boosting the NASA civilian space program at the expense of developing nuclear rockets.

A principal requirement of the disarmament scheme was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and know-how to nonnuclear nations. This was agreed to in the treaty signed last month in Moscow.

Military bases were to have been dismantled and weapons and men stationed abroad were to have been brought home.

We have already dismantled Jupiter and Titan missile bases in Turkey, planned the withdrawal of B-47's and the elimination of IRBM's in Europe. In their place, the administration's policy is to concentrate almost exclusively on Minuteman and Polaris weapons which are limited to a primarily defensive role.

Measures were to have been taken which would reduce the chance of "accidental" war.

The first step—installation of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—has already been accomplished.

We have not yet begun severely cutting back the level of manpower, nor have we ceded compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court or begun to build up that U.N. "peace force" which would ultimately be so powerful that no nation or combination of nations could challenge its will—all specifically called for in the April 1962, disarmament draft treaty.

But after all, that scheme was to have been accomplished over a period of 6 to 10 years and the steps we have already taken have been accomplished in only 14 months.

The really frightening aspect of this story is that, of course, the April 1962, disarmament treaty was rejected at Geneva and the Russians are not bound by any treaty to take the same steps we have been taking—nor is there any indication that they are taking them.

We are disarming unilaterally—in the absence of a treaty and without the least guarantee or inspection system to assure that the enemy will follow suit.

Some 14 months ago the State Department came up with a crazy blueprint for surrender. Although it was vetoed, we are today following that blueprint as if it were the law of the land.

Unless the Kennedy administration makes a sharp turn away from the path it is following, we will be disarmed long before the original timetable has run its course.

[From the San Diego Union, August 12, 1963]

IMAGE OF UNITED STATES MUST BE CLEAR

The Communists, whether they be the Russian variety or the Chinese variety, have one overriding objective, and that is the elimination of everything we stand for as a free people.

What is our present objective?

From all indications we are being committed to an attempt to liquidate the cold war and settle for peaceful coexistence. But in the Soviet Union, the Communists proclaim that peaceful coexistence is an offensive weapon which already is paying dividends in the Red strategy of destroying the West.

How do we get ourselves in such a position?

Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, now is director of the center for strategic studies at Georgetown University. The results of the center's studies have been published by the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, in a book titled, "National Security."

In an introduction, Admiral Burke warns that the United States must take the lead in forming a strategic objective.

"People in our own Nation and those in other nations," he writes, "must have an unblurred understanding of what the United States stands for and what the United States wants to happen."

Just what do we want to see happen in the next few years?

As Admiral Burke points out, change is the essence of history.

"But the trend of future events will not change in the direction we desire unless we do something about it. Time alone will not bring a change in the methods and goals of international communism. We have within our power the capability of eroding communism, but it will not erode itself."

The United States has three choices of action: To retreat before Communist blackmail, leaving the Reds to dominate the world; to attempt to coexist; or, to take the initiative toward elimination of Communists in positions of power everywhere in the world.

Admiral Burke contends that the third alternative does not call for physical annihilation of the enemy, but rather seeks to undermine and erode his positions of power—his whole system.

The United States and all of the free world will never be safe until Communists are out of power in Russia and China.

"The United States is the most powerful nation on earth," Admiral Burke says. "Strategy involves the use of that power in its full array, economic, military, political, cultural, social, moral, spiritual, and psychological, to accomplish national objectives in the world."

A strategy that neglects any one of these is merely a holding action.

The United States, he believes, has a grave responsibility of leadership, one that it cannot avoid—but can fail.

Are we, in failing to pursue the cold war at an hour when the strength of the West can still be marshaled against the revolutionary as well as conspiratorial advance of communism, failing America and our children?

[From the Evening World-Herald, Aug. 1, 1963]

A SOMBER QUESTION

One of the fixed policies of the Department of Defense under President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara is to eliminate the manned bomber; to place total reliance upon missiles for the delivery of nuclear bombs.

This newspaper has often expressed grave misgivings about this policy. We have pointed out, as have many other Americans, that:

1. Missiles have never been fired in anger in time of war.

2. No one knows whether missiles can deliver their payloads reliably on possible enemy targets, and

3. No one can say when a possible enemy may develop a completely effective defense against missiles.

In its current issue, U.S. News & World Report tells the story of this national-defense controversy in detail.

It points out that, under the Eisenhower administration, the Department of Defense had planned to have ready, by the middle 1960's a mixed bomber and missile force which would be capable of delivering nuclear bombs equal to 30 to 40 billion tons of TNT.

Under President Kennedy, this program has been cut back drastically. Present plans call for the total elimination of manned bombers, and the abandonment of all missiles except three: the Titan, the Polaris, and the Minuteman.

And the Kennedy administration proposes to build only enough of these three missiles to deliver, by the late 1960's, 2 billion tons of TNT.

Thus, in terms of capacity for delivering nuclear explosives, the Kennedy goal for the late 1960's is only about 10 percent of the Eisenhower goal for the middle 1960's.

And that isn't all. As U.S. News & World Report puts it:

"No new strategic bomber, missile, or space weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's."

It adds: "Worry about the future U.S. military position is being expressed on a scale not equaled in recent years."

Who are the architects of this drastically revised program for (if we may use the phrase loosely) national defense?

According to U.S. News & World Report, they are the advocates of "what many top military men consider to be a 'softheaded philosophy' about relations with Russia: The idea that the United States can lead Russia to disarmament by first partially disarming itself."

These people sometimes refer to themselves as "peace strategists." Most of them are identified with the leftwing of politics or science. They take the view that the United States must not be "provocative"; it must not be beastly to the Russians; it must set a good example.

On the other side, the side which believes that the United States, if it hopes to survive, must maintain clear military superiority over the Communist bloc, are virtually all of this country's military leaders—including the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Perhaps the most vigorous spokesman of this group is the former Omaha, the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

The most tragic part of this story is that the "peace strategists" apparently are controlling America's military policy, not only in 1963, but for at least the next 10 years.

New weapons cannot be produced overnight. They can be placed on the production line only after many years of research, development and strategic planning.

The Kennedy administration has abandoned planning for such proposed new weapons as the RS-70, the Skybolt, the Dynasoar, and the Nike-Zeus. As U.S. News & World Report says, it has no substitute projects "under serious development."

Thus when the manned bombers are finally phased out, the United States will be obliged to rely for its deterrent power upon missiles which were designed in the 1950's.

Where would we Americans stand if, on some dark morning a few hours hence, we should learn that Russia—or China—has devised ways to neutralize our missiles? None of the "peace strategists" has answered that somber question.

The article in U.S. News & World Report does not make pleasant reading but we strongly recommend it to our readers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 20 1963]

OVERKILL NONSENSE

A great deal of nonsense is being written about "overkill" by persons who have more fear than knowledge about our nuclear weapons stockpile. They seem to believe that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy bought all of those weapons through oversight and that if some well-meaning stranger points out that we have enough arms to "kill" Russian cities many times over we can throw most of the weapons away.

The overkill argument has not impressed the congressional committees that understand military problems, nor has it impressed defense officials in two administrations who have reviewed the size of the stockpile continually. The argument has impressed persons, however, who insist on a simple—and simple-minded—solution to immensely complex and dangerous defense problems.

The fact is that we have a gigantic nuclear stockpile and a \$50 billion defense budget for reasons that are logical, not whimsical. Here is the chain of logic that two administrations have followed with the support of the American people:

First, we must be ready to defend ourselves somehow. Some of the overkill criers are pacifists; this country is not.

Second, we must be able to help defend our friends and allies. Some of the critics are willing to abandon them.

Third, as long as any potential enemy has nuclear weapons, we must have them, too.

Fourth, as long as these weapons exist they can be used, deliberately or by accident, despite the obvious dangers of nuclear war and despite continued efforts to put safety locks on weapons. This is one basic assumption that the overkill crowd surely can agree with.

Fifth, the course of any nuclear war is impossible to predict. Or at least our generals don't believe they can predict it, even though some college professors in this dispute think they can.

Sixth, people are better off alive than dead. This should appeal to the humanitarian instincts of the overkill people, but it rarely seems to.

With these assumptions in mind, the Pentagon has built a military force over the years which is as flexible and bound up with safety factors as \$50 billion a year can make it. It is designed to deter wars, large and small, against us and our allies. It is designed to offer our leaders a chance to steer us through a war, if, God forbid, deterrence fails, with a maximum chance of avoiding total national destruction. It would permit alternative strategies and lifesaving restraints. It includes nonnuclear weapons which can be used in preference to nuclear weapons.

The overkill argument says that since we can perform the simple nuclear-age job of killing enemy civilians with a smaller force we should throw away everything but a handful of the biggest, most horrible nuclear weapons, aim them at Russian civilians and promise to fire if our interests are violated—knowing full well that the Russians will incinerate us from border to border in return.

Our large Defense Establishment, however, does not offer a neat, make-believe solution to the problems of the cold war and nuclear age. But it does offer us a chance to survive as a free country until real solutions can be found. The establishment must be continually reviewed as weapons and world problems change, but it should not be abandoned because of a know-nothing slogan.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 17, 1963]

NO TIME TO LOWER OUR GUARD

The need for a versatile military striking power cannot be denied. There will be brush fires, of a military nature, for years to come. There always is the possibility of nuclear warfare.

It thus is inconceivable that any nation—particularly those which are the prime antagonists in the cold war—would attempt to specialize its weaponry system.

The United States is attempting to do this, by phasing out manned bombers and Navy units in the hope that missiles, as yet unproved, will take care of our defenses.

Adm. Claude Ricketts, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, took cognizance of this situation in his recent address here before the Institute on World Affairs.

"Our military posture must permit the Nation's leaders to employ boldly—and with confidence—political, economical, and psychological action," he said.

As he pointed out, elements of U.S. forces and weapons must be capable of surviving any type of surprise attack and then striking back at the enemy.

"We must be capable of responding quickly," said the admiral. "The warning time of a surprise attack is dwindling away. There is no way we can predict with accuracy nuclear aggression."

At the same time he noted that conventional weapons are essential in such operations as the 7th Fleet's constant vigil in the Formosa Strait. This operation, which started in 1950, has been conducted for 13 years and has prevented an invasion of Formosa, seat of the Nationalist Chinese Government, by Communist forces.

We agree with Admiral Ricketts when he said that the "single type of war" has become ineffective.

"We would be naive to present to the enemy a neat package of solutions and problems," he declared. "He must not even think he has all the answers."

Such conditions demand a versatility of weapons plus the ability to deliver them from land, sea, and air. Such an ability complicates the enemy's plans, as the admiral said.

He continued by stressing that the day of "matching weapon against weapon" is gone.

The enemy must be outflanked tactically and strategically.

This Nation cannot negate the value of a single weapon. We need them all in these curious years of the cold war where anything can happen.

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 13, 1963]

President Kennedy personally induced the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with one exception, to switch from opposition to the nuclear test ban treaty to qualified support of it.

This dramatic backstage about-face by the top military leaders was brought about by the President's using both his personal prestige and great power as Commander in Chief.

At this writing Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Chief of Staff, continues opposed to the pact. He is the only member of the Joint Chiefs adhering to the position all of them originally took in a policy paper they submitted to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee last month.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman, and Gen. Earle Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, changed their views after lengthy talks with the President. General Wheeler has some reservations, but now is supporting the President.

Adm. David McDonald, who replaced Adm. Robert Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations on August 1, is for the treaty. Admiral Anderson, new U.S. Ambassador to Portugal, joined the other Joint Chiefs in their original disapproval of the treaty.

White House insiders credit the President with winning over Generals Taylor and Wheeler by stressing two points: Their opposition would seriously damage U.S. prestige, and would react against the military services.

The President told them that while he expected their support for the pact, he had no objection to their expressing any misgivings they had in response to congressional questions—as long as they did not come out against the nuclear accord.

In the President's talks with the Joint Chiefs, he made much of the claim that a careful White House poll of the Senate had shown that well over two-thirds favor the treaty. On the ground, the President argued military opposition would only cause disunity and reduce the margin of senatorial approval.

"If by some chance the Senate should fail to ratify this treaty," the President warned, "it would be the worst blow to this country's prestige since the Russians launched their sputnik. It would be a diplomatic Pearl Harbor."

Repeatedly the President assured the Joint Chiefs that he would not let the treaty undermine the country's military strength, pointing out he was firmly against cutting the Defense Department budget.

In pounding home this argument, the President opened one night meeting with the Joint Chiefs by telling them he had conferred by phone with Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and had obtained his support to restore \$1 billion of the \$2 billion slashed from the military budget.

As related by the President, MAHON had agreed to increase defense funds from \$47 billion to \$48 billion (approximately \$1 billion under the administration's original request) when the budget is considered by the Senate-House conferees. The House-passed measure is now pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The so-called escape clause in the treaty, permitting participants to withdraw 90 days after serving notice, figured prominently in the President's unavailing efforts to win over General LeMay. The President contended this provision gives the United States ample safeguards.

[From the Sunday Star, Aug. 18, 1963]
**SOVIET CHIEF MAY VISIT CUBA TO
 BOLSTER HAND**

(By John M. Hightower)

Soviet Premier Khrushchev is reported planning to visit Cuba in the fall to strengthen his position in the conflict with Red China over leadership of Communist movements throughout the world.

U.S. officials, who firmly expect Mr. Khrushchev to make the trip to Havana in the next 2 or 3 months, discount the possibility that he will attend the United Nations General Assembly session in New York, opening on September 18. But they say some new development in the China-Soviet dispute might induce him to go.

Mr. Khrushchev is going to Yugoslavia next week. Cuba may be his next big trip.

Mr. Khrushchev probably will try to serve two major purposes by calling on his Western Hemisphere comrade and recent guest, Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

One purpose would be to remind the world anew that Mr. Castro's control over Cuba makes it the first Communist country in the Western Hemisphere—a triumph for Mr. Khrushchev's general policy of peaceful co-existence, which is being regularly denounced by Communist China.

SECOND PURPOSE ASSUMED

Mr. Khrushchev's assumed second purpose, on the surface, is somewhat in conflict with his first and may, therefore, limit the amount of boasting he can engage in. For it is thought here that he would like to find some basis for easing tensions between Cuba and the United States.

Keeping Castro's economy going is costing Russia an estimated \$1 million a day. If Mr. Khrushchev could begin to break down U.S. trade barriers built up around Cuba, he could hope to reduce the cost.

Secretary of State Rusk discussed the Cuban situation with Mr. Khrushchev and with Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko when he was in Russia last week. Mr. Rusk told a news conference Friday that he expressed concern about Soviet military personnel in Cuba and about attempts by Mr. Castro to interfere in the internal affairs of other Latin American countries.

Mr. Rusk would not say how the Russians responded on these points.

U.S. officials estimated that during the crisis over Soviet missiles in Cuba last October, there were 23,000 Russian military men on the island. Last April 3, President Kennedy indicated the number had been reduced to about 12,000. In June, the State Department said withdrawals were continuing.

CONTINUING REMOVAL REPORTED

Reports reaching Washington since have shown continuing Soviet troop removal, including combat troops, but at the moment administration leaders are not sure exactly how the troop total stands.

Mr. Khrushchev obviously did not give Mr. Rusk any hint that Russia would ever weaken its support for Mr. Castro or compromise its declared pledge to defend Cuba with rockets and nuclear weapons if necessary.

That policy, in fact, seems to be reinforced by Mr. Khrushchev's struggle with Red China. He can cite a Communist Cuba as evidence that the Red revolution is continuing under the banners of peaceful co-existence. Red China's leaders, on the other hand, insist on a need for widespread revolutionary violence and perhaps nuclear war.

Mr. Castro's importance to Mr. Khrushchev in this connection emerged clearly earlier this year when the Cuban flew to Moscow at the end of April and stayed in Russia until June 23. He was feted and acclaimed widely.

A May 24 communique announced that Mr. Khrushchev would go to the Caribbean island, "the first socialist state in America," but no date was mentioned.

SOFT APPROACH FORECAST

The impression in high official quarters now is that Mr. Khrushchev will avoid statements of extreme belligerence against the United States on his Cuban trip and will likely try to impress on Mr. Castro a need for restraints on his own behavior.

Despite Mr. Castro's subservience to Kremlin control at the time of his Soviet visit, U.S. officials now find evidence that he is acting contrary to the main line of Soviet world policy and must therefore be causing the Kremlin mild concern.

These officials cite Mr. Castro's raid on one of Britain's Bahama Islands Tuesday to capture fleeing refugees. They also note a July 26 speech in which Mr. Castro spoke out aggressively in favor of Communist revolutions in Latin America, specifying Guatemala and Venezuela as places most nearly ripe.

The heart of Khrushchev's long-range problem with Mr. Castro may prove in the end, however, to be Mr. Castro's loyalties in the split within the Communist bloc.

Mr. Castro has welcomed Chinese advisers in the past and has demonstrated a preference for the militant Chinese brand of aggressive revolution. Yet his economic requirements make him dependent on supplies from the Soviet Union, a field in which Communist China cannot compete.

He is committed to Soviet leadership by necessity rather than by choice, and Mr. Khrushchev may find the commitment highly unreliable if Mr. Castro finds he is able to survive without aid from Russia.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio,
 Aug. 17, 1963]

MILITARY MIGHT IS A VIEWPOINT

WASHINGTON.—It is refreshing to see the administration standing on the rooftops and shouting boastfully about America's military might instead of moaning as the Democrats did prior to the 1960 election about how woefully weak this country had become.

To brag now is, of course, in the administration's interest. For unless the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon can convince Senators and citizens of our nuclear superiority today, then the test ban treaty will not be ratified.

And it was quite obviously in the interest of the 1960 Democrats to talk of missile gaps and American weakness. Some campaigners left the impression that President Eisenhower had deliberately neglected U.S. defenses in order to save money.

The uninformed were led to believe that the combined forces of Ecuador and Venezuela might be too much for us to handle, and such outrageous deceptions probably helped elect Mr. Kennedy.

Some argue today that the Republicans really started the missile gap talk. This is quite true. Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy privately predicted that at one future point, Russia would enjoy a 3-to-1 margin in intercontinental ballistic weapons—if it produced on an all-out basis, using all of its resources, and if we continued with our scheduled pace.

But McElroy and his successor, Thomas S. Gates, also emphasized three other points:

That they were not talking about the present, but about a point several years ahead.

That we were permitting the possible disparity because we did not wish to crank out large numbers of our first, clumsy, unprotected liquid-fueled missiles, preferring to hold off for mass production until we had the much-improved solid-fueled Minuteman and Polaris weapons.

Most important, that the interim "gap" period, which would occur only if the Rus-

sians did utilize their factories 24 hours a day, would not be dangerous because of our tremendous superiority in manned bombers.

Most of the Democrats ignored the fine print and rushed to the people with tearful reports of our perilous predicament. Weapons-happy Air Force generals and profit-seeking missilemakers stood in the wings feeding the politicians with half-facts and spurring them on.

There were a few honest men who understood all of the situation and were, nonetheless, concerned with the possible gap. But 90 percent charged off on partisan courses, ignorant of the facts or ignoring them, and running for office on a "strengthen America" ticket.

The first man in the new administration to apply the brakes was Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who told newsmen privately almost immediately after taking office that there was no existing missile gap and that there would be no "destruction" gap in the future.

It became clear to most Americans over the following months that this country was not in such dreadful shape after all. Top-level speeches proclaiming our nuclear superiority began falling like rain, especially to convince Mr. Khrushchev that he should think twice during the Berlin crisis that first summer.

A few misguided people thought that the Democrats had closed the gap by some weapons magic, but most knew that missiles become operational several years after the day you decide to order them. Our missile force today has not been rushed into being by this administration.

So now we are bragging that our nuclear force is "manifestly superior" to the Soviet Union's.

We have more than 500 long-range missiles, McNamara says, and we will have 1,700 by 1966. And the Soviets have "only a fraction as many." The actual figure of Russian ICBM's is classified, but 135 is a good round estimate.

The Senate is almost certain to ratify the treaty. But if we had been as weak in the fall of 1960 as present administration leaders said we were, we could not conceivably be strong enough this quickly to claim both relative and absolute superiority.

Some smart fellow should be able to find some kind of moral in it all.

PHIL G. GOULDING.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 19, 1963]
SOVIET CLAIMS MISSILE LIKE U.S. SKYBOLT

Moscow, August 18.—The Soviet Union observed aviation day today with a strong hint that Russia has successfully developed an airborne missile similar to the Skybolt scrapped by President Kennedy.

The Communist Party newspaper Pravda stressed the role of rocket-equipped supersonic aircraft that can inflict damage on an enemy "without entering the zone of its antiaircraft defense.

"The combination of modern supersonic planes with powerful rocket armaments is the main feature that defines our air force," Pravda said.

Defense Minister Rodion Malinovsky stressed Russia's readiness for air combat in an order of the day, but his message and press articles were relatively restrained.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 19, 1963]
LET REDS PROVE THEIR RELIABILITY

EDITOR, THE UNION:

The excuse given for Yalta, Potsdam and the other agreements made with the Russians which they have broken is that the United States was duped by the Russians. In the light of past events how will our elected representatives in the Senate in the future be able to use such an excuse?

The writer believes that no treaty of any sort should be approved with the criminals in the Kremlin until such time as they have proved some reliability in living up to past agreements. Let them pull out of East Germany and the other Russian slave provinces, and I suggest they give up their base in Cuba.

Russia's objective remains world domination. Khrushchev repeated it again while our representatives were bowing and scraping in Moscow concerning this test ban treaty. In the event you have any doubt that Russia is not succeeding with its plan, just take a map of the world and enter Russian expansions and dates.

We have heard brave words from the President as a candidate for the Presidency, to the released Cuban patriots in the Orange Bowl, and most recently to the people in Berlin. On the other hand the "bold and imaginative" policies of the present administration have brought abandonment of the Cuban patriots on the Bay of Pigs beachhead; acquiescence in the Russian occupation of Cuba; payment of blackmail to Castro for release of Cuban patriots, and withdrawal of our missiles from Turkey and Italy.

While Secretary Rusk was toasting Gromyko with champagne and Harriman was being embraced by Khrushchev in a bear-hug, men seeking freedom from the Russian slave provinces were being murdered by the "gentle" representatives of the men in the Kremlin. How can the Senate justify acceptance of this test ban treaty?

Adm. JOHN FOSTER.

ON WHAT BASIS CAN PRESIDENT KENNEDY TRUST THE SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE, GROMYKO?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced that President Kennedy will meet with Andrei Gromyko to discuss the easing of tensions. Remembering that this is the same Gromyko who calmly lied to the President about the presence of Russian troops in Cuba, a lie which the President himself exposed within a week, on what basis can he now be trusted?

Is it not about time President Kennedy and the advisers who seem so anxious to please the Soviet Union put the self-interest of the United States first and demand some deeds rather than more words from the Communists before entering into any new agreements? The American people should be made aware of how dangerous the President's flirtation with the Red leaders is to the security of the United States and the peace of the world. Most everyone except the President and the policymakers in the White House and State Department are concerned about our frantic efforts to make some kind of deal with Khrushchev, but the fears of the American people seem to be of no consequence to the Chief Executive as he plunges recklessly ahead in helping Khrushchev save face, finance Communist-controlled nations such as Yugoslavia, protect Red

dictators such as Castro, and pushes his programs by which the United States is unilaterally disarming while the Russians increase their military strength and power in the world.

We may not have too much time left as a free nation if we do not soon demand a responsible foreign policy from the Kennedy administration.

Dr. Robert Morris, in his column "Around the World" reminds us of Gromyko's duplicity, and Communist advances which President Kennedy chooses to ignore. Dr. Morris' column follows:

WILL A NONAGGRESSION PACT BE NEXT?

(By Robert Morris)

While the Senate will be debating the test ban treaty, the diplomatic scene will be shifting toward the President's talk with Andrei Gromyko on the easing of tensions between East and West. It will be recalled that it was Gromyko who lied directly to the President on the presence of offensive missiles in Cuba last year.

What will be involved in these talks will be the Soviet demand for a nonaggression pact following the test ban treaty. We have said that we will not enter such a pact but let us see what is involved.

A nonaggression pact between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would unilaterally and formally call off the cold war as far as the United States is concerned. (It would be unilateral because the Soviets never acknowledge, as their own, Communist parties outside their borders.)

Such a pact would require all NATO countries to recognize the status quo of the Soviet conquest of the Iron Curtain countries involved. It would thus fly directly in the face of the Atlantic Charter and even the U.N. Charter which call for the self-determination of all peoples.

It would do much more. It would commit the United States and all NATO powers not to oppose communism within the Warsaw Pact countries.

The Warsaw Pact countries seem far off to many shortsighted people. But tomorrow they could very well include Castro's Cuba, Goulart's Brazil, Cheddi Jagan's Guyana, or Bosch's Dominican Republic. All the nation would have to do would be to join the pact.

Thereupon the present de facto detente with communism in the hemisphere would become de jure, at least in such countries as would join the Warsaw Pact. A new administration could not take a stand against established communism.

Castro then will have been formally and completely victorious. The Soviet conquest of Cuba, flying as it does in the face of the Monroe Doctrine and the long series of OAS treaties would be formally recognized.

That is what is involved in the Soviet demand. We are told that the United States opposes this. But we have been told other things before about these same issues, including Cuba.

The President said on September 13, 1962: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force against any nation of this Hemisphere . . . then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security, or that of its allies."

Cuba is, as a matter of fact, exporting communism all over the hemisphere, with complete impunity. Communist terrorists are destroying oil installations and kidnapping people in their beds in Venezuela. The Red Cubans are constructing 200 electronically equipped "fishing" trawlers that will be plying the Caribbean, the Florida straits, the Windward Passage, carrying saboteurs and agents wherever they wish.

Last month Castro's forces invaded Anguilla Key in the Bahamas and forcibly

seized 19 Cuban refugees. Not only did the British do nothing to stop the seizures but U.S. forces actually stood by and overheard and watched—for hours—this invasion and kidnapping. To make the point even more shameful, according to Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service the British subsequently arrested, on the very same day five Cuban freedom fighters who have been sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined \$140.

At the beginning of last year, the American people were told that the Russians would be out of Cuba by March 15 last. All reports tell of their presence in greater number there today.

These are just some of the reasons why many people cannot be sure that the talks between the President and Foreign Minister Gromyko will not lead to a nonaggression pact.

RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GAIAMO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GAIAMO. Mr. Speaker, today we are devoting our energies and attentions to the problem of our foreign aid program. Each of us in this House knows full well that the results of our actions here today will have far-reaching significance, and I have no doubt that each Member of this House is approaching this problem with complete sincerity of purpose and conviction.

I do not wish to question in any way the extreme importance of these proceedings, but I do wish to remind my colleagues that in the next few days we will apparently be required to turn our attention to another problem of extreme significance, the solution of which will determine this country's economic progress. I refer to the current railroad labor dispute.

Each day lessens my once-optimistic feeling that this problem could be resolved without either a disastrous strike or the need for Congress to wrestle with the complicated problem of legislation in this field.

As of this moment—in referring to the railroad problem one can only speak of the "moment"—it appears that Congress must act to avert a railroad strike.

The alternatives before us are far from pleasant. First, we have the thorny issue of legislation which will force a solution to the dispute. There are those who feel that the President's proposals represent compulsory arbitration. This is a theory and a mode of operation that is completely antithetical to our labor-management tradition.

But compulsory arbitration, collective bargaining, nationalization, and other suggested alternatives notwithstanding, there is an overriding issue involved—the economy of this country and the public interest.

The President has spoken at length and eloquently of the disaster implicit in a nationwide rail strike. I know I need not emphasize the problem to my colleagues. I would, however, like to speak about the grave threat to my State and all of southern New England. For although Connecticut may have one of the highest per capita incomes in the country, I am indeed afraid that a prolonged railroad strike would turn south-

ern New England into the wealthiest depressed area in the country.

Railroads have been the mainstay of transportation in southern New England for more than 100 years. But although the demand for their service is still high, the largest railroad in the area, the New Haven, has been in bankruptcy for 3 years. Under the control of the court, the trustees can continue to operate the railroad only as long as there is a good chance for reorganization. The trustees themselves have said that they can operate and reorganize without additional Federal financing—barring a natural catastrophe or a railroad strike. The Federal judge who has jurisdiction over the trusteeship himself has said that a strike would be a catastrophe for the New Haven. It is, therefore, impossible to escape the conclusion that a strike could well mean the end of the New Haven.

During the 2 years the trustees have run the railroad, some progress has been made. Operating deficits have been dramatically reduced. New methods of hauling freight have been introduced. Experiments with passenger service changes have been successful—the New Haven is, in short, doing everything possible to continue servicing New England.

Not too long ago, New England's economy was seriously affected by the emigration of the textile industry. But New England's economy has made a transition over the period since the end of World War II that is in the opinion of many virtually without parallel in economic history. Our economy is diversified and flourishing.

The New Haven railroad operates the northern half of the most heavily traveled railroad passenger route in the United States—the "megalopolitan" region that stretches between Boston and Washington. This alone is indicative of its importance.

To illustrate the importance of its freight operations to the economy of southern New England, I would like to point out that evidence offered by a spokesman for the Connecticut chapter of the Associated General Contractors indicates the following: 80 percent of lumber items for construction brought into Connecticut arrive by rail; 67 percent of steel and iron for fabricating; 75 percent of other materials for construction and 100 percent of large contractor equipment. He also estimated that construction costs would rise perhaps by as much as 15 percent if the railroad is eliminated. The vast bulk of Connecticut's newsprint arrives by rail. Connecticut farmers depend on feed grains shipped in from the West. Connecticut consumers depend on it for such necessities as milk. As the Meriden, Conn., Morning Record has editorialized, it is obvious, or should be, that Connecticut's growth would be sharply threatened if main line rail connections withered and disappeared. Again quoting the Record:

New industries would be scared off and old ones discouraged of expansion. It is also obvious that discontinuance of rail freight service would place too heavy a burden on our highways.

One manufacturer in Connecticut has said:

Our present freight cost is about \$950,000 a year. If we lose the New Haven, this will rise by \$300,000 if we use motor carriers.

The potential loss of the New Haven should not be a cause for rejoicing by its competitors—the airlines, trucks, buses, and so forth. Their fate and their future also depend on the general economic prosperity of our region. Without a railroad serving southern New England, all mode of carriage would suffer from the economic decline. The public interest absolutely demands the healthy survival of railroads.

Looking at the situation in terms of human catastrophe, in New Haven alone, 3,000 men and women depend on the New Haven for their employment. Their average income is \$7,200—a strike would represent, therefore, an annual payroll loss of \$21.5 million. And if the very real threat of the liquidation of the New Haven materializes because of a prolonged strike, not only would these people be unemployed, but others who depend indirectly on the railroad would suffer severe economic hardship.

I am sure that all of my colleagues realize the hardships that a strike would bring to their own districts, but I am emphasizing the crisis in southern New England because of the fact that a strike would deal the New Haven railroad a staggering blow from which it—and our economy—would have difficulty in recovering.

The railroad workers in my district are acutely sensitive to this problem. In past months, they have negotiated productively with the railroad. In brief, job cuts on train crews operating within the State was the problem at issue. Connecticut's Public Utilities Commission had approved the cuts in July of 1962; the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen had, of course, protested. Faced with the alternatives of strike or compromise, the brotherhood decided to negotiate. The resultant agreement prevented a local strike. However, even if the brotherhoods serving the New Haven were to refuse to join a nationwide strike, the railroad would still be in danger because of the fact that New England is essentially a terminal area—foodstuffs, machinery, coal, and other necessities of life are brought into New England, and a general work stoppage would imperil that service.

It is extremely frustrating to watch a situation develop that threatens your people. It is temptingly easy to scorn the conduct of both sides in this dispute. Management has told most people that the sole issue is one of featherbedding—a word that is reprehensible to all union men and women. It has not been fully explained that there are other really basic work-rule problems involved—the question of overtime pay, of payment for time held away from home for example. Even a cursory glance into this problem will show anyone that railway workers are operating under labor conditions that virtually every other industry rectified years ago. Management must assume its share of the blame for the impasse. Labor too must share some of the blame.

Automation, other technical advances, changes in type of services demanded by the public—these and other problems undeniably require revision in work rules.

The opinions on the cause of this impasse are as many as those who utter them. Is it perhaps that collective bargaining as a system has broken down? Is it true that there was virtually no significant bargaining until the issuance of the report of the Rosenman Emergency Board on May 13? But since then, what negotiations there have been were futile. Mediation has not worked. Seizure has been eliminated as an "alternative." "Compulsory arbitration," as such, is a destructive precedent.

But however committed we are to the philosophy of collective bargaining, we cannot continue to overlook the fact that the railroad dispute is a problem of monumental importance—that is, it must be solved, or our Nation's economy will be strangled.

It is time to go above selfish interests; it is time for all involved to realize the consequences of their actions. It is time to stop a war of labels—"featherbedding," "railroad poverty myth," "compulsory arbitration."

I believe it is tragic that solution must come by legislation. It is a dangerous sign when Congress must act to force the settlement of a labor-management dispute. But unless there will be new developments from the negotiating parties, it will be up to us to act. And if we adopt the President's proposal—which has merit—will every other labor dispute have to be solved in the same way? Will Congress have to be the last resort in a labor dispute? Will Congress then become in effect a labor court or will it establish a labor court—another dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker, we will make history of a unique sort if congressional action is the only alternative to a strike. It is not the type of history that I will enjoy helping to make. And I fervently hope that congressional action can be avoided. Since this appears increasingly unlikely, I await with interest the recommendations of the Commerce Committee of the other body.

The future of southern New England is at stake—and, indeed, the economic future of the entire country. The full attention of all must be given to averting a disastrous situation. It is not too late for the parties in this dispute to come to some type of agreement that will obviate the need for congressional action. I believe that they will do themselves and their country a great disservice if they refuse to do so.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address myself to the limited test ban treaty that is before the Senate for ratification. Prior to that, however, it seems proper and pertinent to refer to remarks made by me on the floor of this House on July 11, the day

the U.S. negotiating team left the United States.

The subject of my remarks at that time was the bipartisan tradition in this country and its relationship to the then upcoming test ban talks. I said:

This administration has displayed an almost uncanny ability to appeal to the hal- lowed bipartisan tradition once an action in the foreign policy field has been completed. This same administration is strangely silent, however, when the negotiations or plans affecting a future action in this field are first initiated.

Mr. Speaker, the treaty has now been signed. To be ratified it needs bipartisan support. Predictably, we have seen the Senate bombarded with cries for bipartisan support. Yet, there was no offer of bipartisan participation when the negotiators went to Moscow.

Again I quote from my remarks of July 11:

If the President and the majority party are sincerely interested in obtaining bipartisan support for a test ban agreement and for future U.S. action in other areas of foreign policy, let the administration demonstrate its good faith. Let it begin now to couple its demand for bipartisan support with equally impassioned attempts to provide bipartisan participation in the early stages or major actions.

It was my recommendation at that time a member of the minority party at least be sent along to observe, if not actually to take part in the negotiations. This request went unheeded by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, if this type of request continues to go unheeded by the administration, the minority's patience—already running thin—will perhaps run out. The result will be that the administration's future requests for bipartisan support will also go unheeded by the minority.

I bring this up at the beginning of my remarks on the limited test ban treaty because the administration has asked immediately for a great debate and ultimately for approval and ratification of the treaty. In my remarks of a month ago, I listed a number of examples similar to the test ban treaty in which support was requested but meaningful participation was denied. My statement of July 11 appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the heading "Piecemeal Bipartisanship Is Unworkable."

Mr. Speaker, the treaty is now being debated on its merits. Reluctantly, I will join with my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to judge the treaty solely on its merits and in the greater context within which it exists. However, this one-sided exploitation of the bipartisan tradition cannot be tolerated much longer by the minority party. Unless the administration begins sincerely to exercise the true bipartisan tradition, it, too, like many other fine traditions of the past, will be consigned to the annals of past history. Let us hope it can still be salvaged.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to a consideration of the treaty itself. The President has asked for a full public discussion of this treaty. I commend the President for encouraging this discus-

sion and were I a Member of the Senate would not announce my support or opposition to this treaty until the current hearings are completed.

Mr. Speaker, the limited test ban treaty, we have been told, is unimportant, insignificant and, by itself, cannot adversely affect our national security. The Joint Chiefs have told the Stennis subcommittee that despite the military disadvantages in the treaty "they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable." The President and his many spokesmen constantly emphasize the many things the treaty will not do. The central theme, obviously, is to minimize, downgrade, and render unimportant any implications contained in the treaty.

To an extent, this is persuasive reasoning. The President, after all, put the major portion of the treaty into effect unilaterally last June 10 by his speech at American University. Before or after the effective date of the treaty, our resumption of atmospheric testing was solely dependent upon the actions of other nations, especially the Soviet Union.

The key question, of course, is whether the Senate should ratify the treaty. Notwithstanding the belief shared by so many that the treaty is relatively unimportant, the Senate does have a profound duty to examine the treaty in all its aspects.

This, of course, is currently being done. The treaty must be fully examined in the context within which the President and other administration spokesmen have placed it. It has been hailed as a first step. We have been told—if not in so many words, at least by strong and unmistakable implication—what the next step is expected to be.

We shall not have discharged our obligation to examine all of the ramifications of this treaty until we have examined what can reasonably be expected to follow and until we have determined whether in fact we wish to take such a followup step.

Ratification of the treaty does not commit us to accept a nonaggression pact. But it does set an immense psychological bias for such a pact.

Some Senators have indicated tentative support for ratification of the treaty. At the same time, some of these same Senators have indicated that under no circumstances could they support the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Do these Senators undermine their own opposition to a nonaggression pact by voting for the test ban treaty?

If so, should they vote for the test ban treaty? This is a matter that each individual Senator must judge for himself. I bring this up because I have seen no concerted effort on the part of Senators, either individually or collectively, to address themselves to this very serious consideration. The Nation is preoccupied with the treaty itself. It is time to step outside of the treaty and look at the broader picture from a wider perspective.

The President of the United States has made clear repeatedly that we are hopeful that this test ban treaty, modest as it is, will form the basis for another step

and another step. In his words, at a recent press conference, we seek a "genuine detente" that "covers a broad area." The President said:

I think we should pursue, however, the next step and the next step to see if we can bring about a genuine detente. We don't have that yet.

A genuine one—which covers a broad area. What we have now is the limited test ban agreement and we should recognize it as an important step but only a first step.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. We could quote Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, President Kennedy in his address to the Nation, in his recent press conference, in his message to the Senate which accompanied the transmittal of the treaty to that body, many other administration spokesmen, distinguished Members of both Houses of the Congress, and numberless editorials that appeared in the Nation's press since the treaty was initialed in Moscow. If we quoted every story, every statement, every briefing that concerned itself with favorable consideration of the test ban treaty, we would find that two major themes constantly reappear. The first is the theme of the "first step." The second is the appeal to emotion much more often than to fact.

Let us examine for a moment some of the implications contained in both of these recurring themes. Let us first look at the treaty itself, attempt to peel away some of the emotion and look only at facts.

First. In terms of U.S. commitments, the treaty is relatively unimportant. The bulk of its provisions were put into effect long before the negotiators left Washington for Moscow. Atmospheric testing was officially suspended by executive fiat on June 10 at American University by the President.

But although the treaty is relatively unimportant in one sense, there are, nevertheless, grave implications that could be at least potentially dangerous to the United States.

For ratification of the present treaty, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are said to hold a decisive influence over the outcome. On their approval, we are told, hangs the approval of a great many Senators. Last week the Joint Chiefs statement to the Stennis Armed Services subcommittee was released. It indicated qualified approval. One significant statement the Joint Chiefs made was that the treaty promised to help deter war by restraining further proliferation of nuclear weapons and by reducing world tensions. They then said, and this is the most significant part:

These possibilities are of such importance to the United States that they offset the foreseeable technological disadvantages.

What do they mean by the "foreseeable technological disadvantages?" Disadvantages in relation to what? In relation to the state of the art in the Soviet Union?

In conclusion—

The Chiefs also wrote—the Joint Chiefs have reached the determination that while there are military disadvan-

tages to the treaty they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable.

This for the first time in public officially established the fact that there are military disadvantages in this treaty. Those of us serving on the Defense Appropriations committee had realized this for some time.

Mr. Speaker, an apparently forgotten article by Richard Fryklund, of the *Evening Star*, should be of interest to my colleagues. It is the only public report of the positions taken by the Chiefs behind closed doors of congressional committees and within their own councils. I have asked unanimous consent that the article, dated June 12, and bearing the headline "Service Chiefs Oppose Air-Test Moratorium," be inserted in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that no denial or clarification, at least to my knowledge, has been issued by the Joint Chiefs or other responsible officials questioning the accuracy of this article. Within the past few days we have learned that the Chiefs would have probably taken an entirely different position if it were not for the fact that the treaty has already been signed.

At this point, I would like to quote one or two passages from the article. It states:

The Chiefs of Staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.

They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.

If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, since this article appeared, we have seen reports in the Nation's press to the effect that the administration has made a tremendous effort to get the Joint Chiefs at least to refrain from opposing the test-ban treaty if they could not bring themselves to support it actively. The Chiefs' very qualified support indicated that the administration has been successful.

It would behoove those Senators who feel themselves obligated to be guided solely by the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to look at this qualified support in the context of the Chiefs' earlier publicly reported remarks.

Second. Many top experts believe that the Soviet Union may be ahead—as a result of their last test series—in the development of large nuclear explosives as well as in the development of an antimissile missile system. Secretary McNamara and the Joint Chiefs, in their statements to the Senate publicly confirmed the fact that the Soviets are ahead in high-yield nuclear weapons. To proceed with developments in both areas, certain tests in the atmosphere would be necessary. If the Soviets are ahead in either area—and they apparently are in at least one of them—the test ban treaty appears to preclude the possibility of our overtaking them.

Third. On the question of trusting the Soviets to live up to the treaty, one

should at least go to the historical record for some indication of Soviet past performance. They have violated some 50 agreements out of some 53 they have negotiated with the West. President Kennedy, in announcing the Soviet buildup in Cuba to the Nation last October, accused Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko of having told the President a deliberate lie about the missiles then in Cuba. It was this same Gromyko who was the head of the Soviet negotiating team in Moscow last month and who initialed the treaty for the Soviet Union.

Fourth. Although many top experts believe that the Soviet Union may now be ahead of the United States in terms of large explosives, no one doubts the U.S. superiority in terms of tactical nuclear weapons. However, tactical nuclear weapons can be developed and tested underground—an area that is not prohibited by the current treaty. Thus, although the United States is prevented from attempting to catch up with the Soviet Union in terms of large explosives and antimissile missiles—if they are ahead in this area—nothing in the treaty prevents the Soviet Union from trying to close the gap in the tactical weapons area. Significantly, the Joint Chiefs, in their statement, verified this same point.

Fifth. The above-ground implementation of Project Plowshare—the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for such things as creating harbors, canals, and so forth—are apparently precluded by the treaty.

Sixth. One of the arguments used for the treaty is that it will prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. This is a simple statement to make but nothing in the treaty substantiates this statement. In fact, it could be argued that the opposite effect is more probable. If both the Soviet Union and the United States do in fact refrain from testing, other countries—notably France and Red China—might be tempted to lessen the nuclear gap that now exists between them and the major powers. This may not be a realistic goal for such countries, but it will be a tempting one, nonetheless.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the facts that a close examination of the limited test ban treaty should bring out for full public discussion. It is possible—though to my mind very doubtful—that all of these objections can be dispelled and that the treaty would emerge as in no way detrimental to the national security interests of the United States.

There are some questions, however, that the treaty leaves unanswered and that I hope the Senate will raise during the course of the hearings. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will list 10 of the more significant ones.

First. If the test ban is ratified as it undoubtedly will be and it later becomes known that the Soviets have an operational antimissile missile, how would this affect the balance of power and what action would the United States take, if any?

Second. If, as a result of the test ban, the Soviets do begin to reduce our margin of strategic superiority, what compensatory steps could the United States

take which would not require other than underground testing?

Third. Could circumstances develop in which the United States felt it necessary to its national security to abrogate the treaty under terms other than those contained in the treaty? What effects would this have?

Fourth. What would happen if the Soviets violate this agreement? What if we accuse them of a violation and they deny it? Would the evidence be in all cases conclusive? Or, should we expect a lengthy debate in this country over the evidence of violation and the course of action which the United States ought to pursue?

Fifth. Does the President's statements on the inability of any nation to produce a workable AICBM system indicate that we have, in fact, abandoned this program? What evidence is there that either we or the Russians cannot develop or have not developed such systems? How do the President's statements square with those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense?

Sixth. Even if a 58-megaton bomb is considered an impractical weapon is there no effect of such a blast that could give the Soviet an advantage on the basis of their testing so far? Testimony before my committee and even some newspaper accounts have indicated that the military attaches significance to such a large weapon's capability to disrupt communications and to destroy significant targets.

Seventh. Questions have been raised as to the meaning of the term "outer space" as used in the treaty. Some terminology defines outer space as near space. What verification means have been agreed upon as acceptable evidence of deep space testing?

Eighth. The United States so far has not authorized a single space weapons program. The Soviets, on the other hand, have continually emphasized the importance of this field of weaponry. What would be the psychological effect—not to mention the military effect—if the Russians should orbit a 100-megaton space weapon sometime in the future?

Ninth. In what manner can the Executive actually assure a readiness to test that would cover a significant period of time in light of the President's own past statements about the effect on the morale of scientists who are asked to remain prepared while knowing they will probably not be allowed to test for indefinite periods of time?

Tenth. As to the treaty's so-called ability to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, how can this work? A major case made for the treaty is that it is self-policing. There is no self-policing arrangement that could prevent one nation from encouraging or participating in testing outside its own borders. Only an international inspection system that could check on the shipment of fissionable materials could guard against this in practical terms.

Mr. Speaker, these are questions and problems that relate directly to the treaty alone. All of the many pertinent questions should be raised again and again until all are answered satisfactorily, if this is possible. However, this

is only one aspect of the two-pronged implications of the treaty. We are constantly reminded by the President and other spokesmen for the treaty that it should not be considered in isolation. I am now referring, of course, to the "first step" theme.

In all administration pronouncements that I have seen or heard, there appears always to be a clear-cut reference to a nonaggression pact as a possible second step.

In the communique that accompanied release of the text of the treaty, this illuminating statement immediately followed the declaration that all three signatories of the treaty regarded it as an important first step:

The heads of the three delegations discussed the Soviet proposal relating to a pact of nonaggression between the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the participants in the Warsaw Treaty. The three Governments have agreed fully to inform their respective allies in the two organizations concerning these talks and to consult with them about continuing discussions on this question with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants.

It seems to be a foregone conclusion, agreed upon by the three negotiating teams with the full consent of their parent governments, that immediately after the test ban treaty is effective, a full and concerted effort will be undertaken to bring about the speedy conclusion of a nonaggression pact.

If this is the case, perhaps we should ask ourselves now, before the treaty is ratified, what a nonaggression pact with all of its ramifications will mean.

First. It could mean at least tacit approval by our Government of the existing divided Germany. It could also mean the tacit recognition of East Germany's status as a sovereign and independent power. Ultimately, it could lead as well to the neutralization of West Germany.

Second. It would signify the abandonment of those freedom-loving peoples in the captive nations, who although close to despair now, would as a result of such a pact, lose all hope of ultimate liberation.

Third. It would probably mean the suspension of USIA and Voice of America broadcasts into the satellite countries because the Soviets have long labeled such broadcasts "aggressive."

Fourth. It is possible that Cuba, after the conclusion of a nonaggression pact, would be invited to join the Warsaw Pact countries. As a result we would be formally forced to do what we have regretfully already begun—protect the existence of the Cuban regime against outside attack—by exile groups, for example.

Fifth, and this consideration applies both to the test ban treaty and to the nonaggression pact, as well as to any subsequent steps we might attempt to make. It will engender a false sense of euphoria, a misleading atmosphere of hope that the Communists are mellowing and that the world can now look to a prolonged period of stability in which tensions will continue to diminish. This is perhaps the most dangerous result the treaty can bring about. A period of

genuine peace will only come about when the Communists—either on their own, or through irresistible pressure from a strong West—cease in their fanatical drive to dominate the world. This, they have not as yet done. In fact, on July 14, 1963, in the long Soviet open letter which was a reply to Chinese charges, it was stated:

We (the Soviets) fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we are flying in the face of history, our own experience, and the demonstrable knowledge of repeated deceit and deception which have become the bywords of all Soviet actions. Everyone is for peace. But no one in a responsible position should hold this test ban treaty up as the only—or even the most likely—way to attain peace. The treaty should be recognized for what it is—a gamble. It should be seen as a step that may or may not have adverse effects on U.S. security. We must not minimize the fact that the possibility exists that it is fraught with dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I too join with the President in hoping that the whole Nation will join in this public dialog but I would caution the people of this Nation to separate fact from emotion and reality from hope in order that we may all reason well as a nation.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 12, 1963]

SERVICE CHIEFS OPPOSE AIR-TEST MORATORIUM

(By Richard Fryklund)

The chiefs of staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.

They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.

If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

NO PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The service chiefs have no plans to speak out publicly, but if asked by a congressional committee, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, reportedly are ready to say it is vital to American security to continue testing.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is reported to have stood with the service chiefs in past private protests against moratorium proposals, but it is not known how he would testify specifically on the Kennedy plan.

Civilian leaders in the Pentagon will be split if they are asked to testify, these informed sources said.

Defense Secretary McNamara will support a moratorium as he has in the past. But at least one and perhaps all of the service Secretaries are reported ready to oppose a moratorium.

Up until this week the position of Pentagon leaders on testing had been almost academic because the Russians had been showing no signs of signing any agreement.

THREE-NATION TALKS

On Monday, however, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States, Britain, and

Russia will hold high-level discussions in Moscow in July on a test ban, and he said that meanwhile the United States would not test in the atmosphere if other countries refrain.

His plan would permit underground, undersea, and space testing.

A similar moratorium was tried by President Eisenhower, starting in the fall of 1958. He gave up all testing, as did the Russians.

In September 1961, however, the Russians suddenly resumed testing with the biggest explosions ever set off. The United States then started a long series of tests.

Both sides are now in a testing lull.

Tests in the air give off the most radioactivity and therefore have been the particular target of persons concerned about fallout. At the same time, such tests are the most useful in the development of weapons.

The service chiefs do not want to stop them, largely because they believe there is a good chance that the Russians now know more than we do about the possible vulnerability of our ICBM's to enemy near-misses.

Military men point out that since the last moratorium was ended the Russians have set off three times the number of explosions that we have. Many of these explosions were monsters—up to 58 megatons, more than twice as large as any the United States has tested.

Apparently some of the explosions were in "wargame" situations where they were used against simulated American weapons.

These military men fear the Russians may have found weaknesses in American ICBM installations or in the communications and support networks.

American tests have pitted A-bombs against some of the components of the American ICBM underground "silos," but never against a whole silo and its supporting equipment.

It is known, however, that nuclear explosions create electromagnetic waves which under some circumstances can disrupt electrical equipment from a considerable distance. If American ICBM's are vulnerable, the American chiefs do not want the Russians to be the only ones to know it.

SEEK "CLEAN" BOMBS

The service chiefs are also interested in perfecting "clean" weapons—that is, bombs that would not create radioactive fallout in time of war, anti-ICBM weapons and bigger weapons.

The Russians say they can orbit a 100-megaton weapon, and their tests have indicated that this may be an understatement. The chiefs do not believe these would be economical weapons, but they fear they could have great psychological effect whizzing over American and foreign cities. The chiefs want to be able to match the stunt.

All of these weapons advances would require additional testing in the atmosphere.

REDS GOT JUMP

Some of the Chiefs believe the last moratorium was disastrous to American interests. It is argued that the Russians prepared important tests during the ban and may even have tested underground in secret.

After the Russians broke the moratorium with a series of important tests, the United States had to build slowly toward major tests. Therefore, some military men say, the Russians may have been given a chance to catch up or move ahead in some weapons categories.

The basic argument for a moratorium or complete test ban is that the United States is now ahead and the ban would freeze that lead. Secretary of Defense McNamara took this position during hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee in February.

At that time, the three service Chiefs and service Secretaries, under questioning by Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said continued atmospheric testing "is nec-

essary for the security of the United States * * * under the present circumstances."

The public record of the closed-session testimony indicates they were not asked their reasons.

WILL THEY REPUDIATE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have received an invitation from Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young to attend what they describe as their "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom" which will be held on August 28, 1963, in Washington, D.C. I herewith include my reply:

AUGUST 22, 1963.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR SIRS: I have received your R.S.V.P. invitation to attend your rally on August 28. I will not be attending although I do appreciate your courtesy.

I would like to comment on several aspects of your so-called "march" and raise a question or two. I note that the man who is organizing your march is one Bayard Rustin and that A. Philip Randolph has given Rustin his "absolute confidence" in the planning of the affair. Rev. Martin Luther King is reported in the Washington Post as calling Rustin "a brilliant and most persuasive interpreter of nonviolence." It is my information that this same Bayard Rustin served 28 months in Federal prisons for failure to abide by selective service law; that he was arrested and convicted on a sex perversion charge in Los Angeles in January 1953; that he was affiliated with the Communist Party in one of its auxiliaries, the Young Communist League and as recently as 1956 attended one of the C.P.'s national conventions. Would you please let me know if you had this information when assigning Rustin to this key job? If so, why would you ask me to appear on a platform with such an individual? Will Mr. Rustin be among those welcomed by the President?

The Cleveland Plain Dealer on August 16, 1963, in a front page story reported that Eric J. Reinthaler, admitted Communist, was reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups, CORE, which is sending Freedom March buses to your demonstration. Have you repudiated Mr. Reinthaler? Will he be among those welcomed by the President?

It is a strange double standard that you and most of the affiliated groups who are participating in your march have. If I were to appear with members of various so-called rightwing organizations who in no way are Fascist, Communist, or Communist-oriented, the AFL-CIO, CORE, COPE, ADA, your group, and others would scream to high heavens. Where is the concern over the obvious involvement in your march of people with such dubious background and political philosophy? I believe you owe an obligation to the many fine people who believe in what you are doing to exercise greater diligence in selecting your leadership and to repudiate the radical left and Communist involvement in your efforts. Many so-called liberals seem to be the first to scream about others repudiating this group or that group but the last to care about their own ranks.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress.

The invitation I received is as follows:

Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young, cordially request the attendance of JOHN M. ASHBROOK, at the mass assembly for jobs and freedom Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 2 p.m. at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON
FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM.

NEW YORK CITY.
R.S.V.P.

This card will admit you to the section reserved for Members of the Congress of the United States.

I am including with these remarks the articles to which I referred from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and an editorial from the Cleveland Press on the same subject.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 16, 1963]

TWO FREEDOM MARCH BUSES BOOKED BY
ADMITTED RED—REINTHALER ACTS HERE FOR
CORE

(By William C. Barnard)

Eric J. Reinthaler, who has admitted Communist Party affiliations, has been identified by Cleveland police as the reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups sending freedom march buses to a mass Negro demonstration in Washington on August 28.

Reinthaler, 39, a longtime participant in civil rights movements here, has a long record of affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations, police said yesterday.

In a 1958 trial Reinthaler admitted he had been a Communist up until 1954.

Members of the Cleveland department's special investigation unit said Reinthaler identified himself as the contract agent for the Cleveland chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant Negro civil rights organization, in the chartering of two Greyhound buses for the trip.

CORE has announced it will send 78 persons to Washington to participate in the Freedom March. The two CORE buses are part of a cavalcade of eight chartered buses and a private plane that will be taking more than 350 Clevelanders to the Nation's Capital for the Negro civil rights demonstration.

Civil rights leaders have said that more than 100,000 persons from scores of cities will participate in the protest.

The Cleveland delegation is being organized by a newly formed civil rights group, the United Freedom Movement (UFM). A spokesman for UFM last night denied knowledge of Reinthaler's role with CORE and said UFM's arrangements were not connected with CORE.

Following Plain Dealer efforts to reach Reinthaler and other CORE officers, a call was received from Bruce Marshal, who identified himself as vice president of Cleveland's CORE chapter. He made this statement:

"CORE has certain admission requirements which Reinthaler has met. We ask two questions of prospective members: (1) Do you believe in civil rights and equality between the races? (2) Do you believe unequivocally in nonviolence?"

"Every member is asked this and we do not ask what his other affiliations are or have been."

Lt. Martin P. Cooney and Sgt. John J. Ungvary of the special investigation unit of the police department said Reinthaler made arrangements for the buses through a travel agent. At that time he left a \$50 deposit.

Last Saturday Reinthaler and an official of CORE sent a telegram to the agent confirming the arrangements, the officers said. In the telegram Reinthaler listed himself as the contract agent for CORE and gave his home phone number, they said.

In 1958 Reinthaler and six other persons were convicted on charges of conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law in U.S. District Court here.

The seven were found guilty of conspiracy to file false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board. U.S. District Judge Paul C. Weick, now an appellate judge, sentenced Reinthaler to 18 months in the Federal prison at Milan, Mich., and fined him \$2,500. Reinthaler served the term after losing higher court appeals.

Reinthaler was identified in the trial as an officer of a Cleveland local of the United Electrical Workers which was expelled in 1948 from the Congress of Industrial Organization, now merged into the AFL-CIO. The Taft-Hartley law requires union officers to submit affidavits stating whether they ever were Communist Party members.

In the trial, Reinthaler admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various periods from 1938 to 1954. He said he was a member of the Communist Party in Cleveland, Steubenville, and Youngstown and had been a Communist organizer in the Steubenville area.

The Reverend Charles W. Rawlings, director of the Office of Religion and Race of the Cleveland Presbytery, who is assisting in the UFM protest cavalcade, said: "We cannot stop fighting for racial justice because these causes have been exploited by organizations such as the Communist Party for their self-interest."

Clarence H. Holmes, president of the Cleveland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and leader of UFM, said he was surprised that CORE was sending its own buses. He said all arrangements for the civil rights movement in Cleveland were to be coordinated by the UFM.

The Plain Dealer was unable to reach Reinthaler last night for comment.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,
Aug. 16, 1963]

REINTHALER JOINED COMMUNISTS TWICE—WAS
ONLY 14 FIRST TIME

Eric J. Reinthaler, who is listed as a bus contract agent for the Cleveland branch of the Congress of Racial Equality, began his Communist affiliation at a young age.

At his Federal conspiracy trial here in 1958, Reinthaler testified he joined the Young Communist League in Youngstown in 1938 when he was 14 years old and attending Youngstown Chaney High School.

At the time he was working in the steel mills in Youngstown, he said, the Communist Party was active in the "little steel" strike. He said he stayed in the party league until 1941.

In 1943 Reinthaler went into the Army and served in France and Germany as a machine-gunner. He was wounded December 2, 1944, and was hospitalized, he related. He was discharged from the Army in 1946.

Reinthaler said he received the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal and European campaign ribbons for his military service.

Reinthaler said he joined the Communist Party in 1946 when he went to work for Republic Steel Corp. in Youngstown.

He told the court he remained in the Communist Party until 1954.

From 1948 until 1950, he related, he had been an organizer in the Ohio Valley section of the Communist Party with headquarters in Steubenville.

In 1949 the Daily Worker, the Communist Party organ in the United States, reported Reinthaler was among protestors in New

York on behalf of top Communist leaders on trial in the first of a series of Communist conspiracy trials.

Labor records show that Reinthaler had been a steward, an executive board member, the legislative secretary and an editorial writer for Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers Union.

Reinthaler, whose last known address was 1568 Ansel Road NE., was born in Salem, Ohio, on January 7, 1924. He moved to Youngstown in 1936 and to Steubenville in 1948.

He came to Cleveland in 1950 for treatment at Brecksville Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Reinthaler had attended Bethany College in Bethany, W. Va., and later studied at Western Reserve University. He was dismissed at WRU in 1953 for bad grades.

In 1952 he represented himself to city officials as a member of the Progressive Party when he was protesting the arrest of a friend.

In 1953 the Cleveland Council on World Affairs expelled Reinthaler after his Communist affiliations were disclosed. The Plain Dealer at that time ran news stories revealing that Reinthaler had worked his way up to membership on a policymaking group of the council.

Reinthaler served 18 months in a Federal prison for his conviction in the conspiracy trial. Six others, including Fred and Marie Reed Haug, once influential labor leaders here, were convicted of a conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 17, 1963]
FREEDOM MARCH MUST KEEP AN EYE ON REDS

Disclosure that Eric Reinthaler, admittedly a former Communist, hired a couple of buses for the Negro march on Washington is something of a shock. But perhaps it shouldn't be a surprise.

It's ancient history that the Communist Party and its adherents love to infiltrate legitimate groups and purposes to twist them to Marxist ends. There was no reason to doubt the Reds would regard the August 28 freedom march as another opportunity to stir trouble and win America some bad headlines around the world.

The Nation, from President Kennedy on down, has pretty much accepted the civil rights march as a nonviolent demonstration for decent purposes.

A Communist flavor is something else again. With known Reds gathering themselves into the demonstration, danger of violent incidents becomes an even greater possibility than previously. Leaders of the march have a truly formidable job in keeping it within its controlled, peaceful plan.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate on August 27, 28, and 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF BARS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would authorize lawyers to practice before Federal agencies without special admission to agency bars. It provides for the right of persons to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by most of the Federal agencies, but it should be extended to all agencies. My bill would make this uniformity possible.

Several agencies in recent years have abandoned admission requirements, but these are still imposed by some agencies. I see no reason to impose admission requirements on attorneys or to interpose restraints on a citizen's right to be represented by an attorney of his choice, when an attorney has already been determined qualified to represent others in his State. The passage of this bill will do away with these cumbersome admission requirements, giving recognition to the right of persons and concerns to be represented by the counsel of their choice. This would directly benefit the client, whose legal problems in Washington could then be handled by his local attorney.

The analysis of the bill is as follows:

Section 1(a) provides that any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia, in which he resides or maintains an office, may represent others before any agency.

Section 1(b) imposes upon the attorney the responsibility of setting forth his qualifications and provides appropriate penalties for misrepresentation. It requires that when an attorney appears in person or puts his signature to a paper before the agency, this constitutes a representation to the agency that he is qualified and authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

Section 1(c) provides that there shall be no changes in existing statutes which permit practice before certain agencies by nonlawyers. Neither would it change an agency's existing authority to discipline persons who appear in a representative capacity before it.

Section 1(c) (iii) makes it clear that present provisions of law or agency rules are not disturbed by this legislation; that is, it would not authorize an attorney who was formerly an employee of an agency to represent others before it where such is prohibited by statute or regulation.

Section 2 of the bill is implicit in its purpose that the agency recognize and deal with the attorney who is qualified to appear in a representative capacity before it. It provides that when any participant is represented by an attorney and that fact has been made known in writing to the agency, any notice, or other written communication required or permitted to be given to or by such participant shall be given to or by such attorney. This recognition would include conferences, correspondence, and service of documents or notices. A similar

recommendation was made by the recent administrative conference.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the simplification and clarification of our administrative procedures. I believe this legislation is a major step in the right direction. It would solve two paramount problems for attorneys practicing before Federal regulatory agencies: First, the admission of attorneys and, second, recognition of attorneys. There have been great discrepancies in the field of recognition. Much valuable time needed to prepare for a case has been lost by service going to the client when direct service upon an attorney would have given counsel full information.

Furthermore, when an attorney has been determined qualified to represent others in his State and to be of good character and reputation, and has been licensed by the State authority to practice in any field of the law, he is deemed qualified to handle before courts or tribunals in his State any matter which can be handled before any Federal agency. Therefore, why should admission and control of practice be duplicated at the Federal level through a maze of multiple and conflicting regulations of various agencies?

The principles of this legislation have been approved by the American Bar Association, and the text has been approved by the chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Federal Administrative Practice Act. I am confident that it will receive the support of attorneys throughout the country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill aimed at increasing the opportunity for private homeownership in Latin America.

It is my belief that private homeownership is one of the best anti-Communist weapons available to the United States, as well as one of the best methods of stimulating private enterprise in developing countries.

My bill provides for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank. Its pattern and function would be similar to our own Federal Home Loan Bank Board, by which the great savings and loan industry and institutions of this country have been built.

With local capital and local citizen management these associations have been a major help in providing financing for construction and private homeownership. This same impetus to private housing, construction, and financing will be made available under the International Home Loan Bank Board to other areas of the world.

The measure empowers the IHLB to invest in loans or advances or in shares of foreign mutual thrift and home financing institutions and foreign home loan banks, or in interests in any of the same. The Bank shall have all the powers and authority customary or appropriate to conduct an international banking organization to serve such institutions and banks.

Under the bill the International Home Loan Bank would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Guidance on those aspects of its operations affecting foreign policy will be given by the Department of State. The Bank's Board of Directors shall consist of 12 duly elected U.S. citizens and 2 ex officio directors, 1 to be nominated by the Secretary of the Treasury and 1 to be nominated by the Secretary of State, who shall serve as advisers to the Bank concerning matters coming within the interests of these respective departments.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, I have strongly supported the foreign aid program and particularly that portion of it which would and does assist private enterprise and private housing development in those countries striving for political and economic betterment.

Through the Agency for International Development considerable help has been given to the development of savings and lending institutions in developing countries. These institutions act as reservoirs for local savings and channel those savings into reasonably long-term mortgages at reasonable interest rates. U.S. foreign aid has already been instrumental in the creation of savings and loan associations in Argentina, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela, and of an FHA system in Guatemala, as well as in other countries around the world. Not only has the "seed" capital been provided, but technical assistance and training has been made available. This program has been invaluable in fostering the concept of savings by local citizens and the use of their savings for their own benefits.

To engender hope by practical assistance in making possible private homebuilding and private homeownership by those who previously dared not even dream of such benefits, entirely apart from the economic phases of the influx of private American capital, is assuredly a worthwhile objective. Enactment of legislation establishing an International Home Loan Bank would be a major contribution to the betterment of living conditions in Latin America and toward achievement of our foreign policy aims.

ANNUAL NATIONAL BANQUET OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored and flattered to represent the Veterans Affairs Committee of the House, its distinguished and able chairman, OLIN TEAGUE, and the Congress at the annual national banquet of the Disabled American Veterans in Miami, Fla. I will give this great dedicated and patriotic organization your best wishes and your highest esteem.

The Disabled American Veterans epitomizes the hardships and sacrifices of those men and women who fought in the air, on the seas and around the world to preserve this great Nation. They are continuing to fight in peacetime to perpetuate, for all time to come, the principles and ideals, liberties and justice for our people for which they fought on the battlefronts.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leave of absence from the House to bring this great group your best wishes; to encourage these men and women in their efforts to maintain freedom, also in their efforts both in behalf of the veterans and to maintain for the veterans fair and adequate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if a vote should come tonight on this foreign aid bill, of course I will be paired against it. I have always been opposed to the principle of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe foreign aid is unconstitutional. Under foreign aid, we have built superhighways for the camel and the donkey. We have helped to foster dictatorships and the overthrowing of governments. We have subsidized foreign industries to compete with and undermine our own. We have drained our Treasury and gold reserves. We have placed on the American people an almost unbearable tax burden. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to balance the budget, give the people a sound dollar, cut out all unnecessary Federal spending and then we can give the American people a badly needed tax cut.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Governors' Conference, meeting earlier this week at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., located in the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the privilege to represent, adopted a resolution urging a continuation and strengthening of the oil import program.

The resolution, the text of which is reprinted below, declared that "imports of crude oil and its derivatives and products, particularly residual oil used for fuel, constitute a constant and increas-

ing threat to all domestic fuels industries" and urged the President "to take positive action to strengthen the oil import program so the amount of oil which can be imported will be more effectively controlled."

Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, which has long spoken out for effective import controls on oil, issued a statement commending the Governors for their action. In his statement, which will be of interest to all Members of this body who are concerned about the welfare of our domestic fuels industries, Mr. Moody said:

It is encouraging to the Nation's coal producers, coal miners and railroads that the chief executives of our Southern States have unanimously recognized the economic damage being caused by excessive imports of both residual and crude oil, and are urging that steps be taken to hold such imports to levels that will not further injure the domestic fuels industries.

Although imports of oil, including residual, have been limited by Executive action since the spring of 1959, the permissible quota levels for residual have constantly been increased and today they are running at a rate of about 84 millions barrels per year greater than the rate established when the program began.

Total imports this year will be equal in heating value to more than 50 million tons of coal. It is not hard to see what an impact this vast amount of waste foreign fuel, dumped on the east coast utility and industrial-commercial market, is having on the economy of coal-producing areas of America. The domestic petroleum-producing States have been hard hit also by imports of both crude oil and of foreign residual.

I understand that Governors Barron of West Virginia, Combs of Kentucky, Bellmon of Oklahoma, and Connally of Texas were particularly active in presenting and supporting this important resolution, and the thanks of all those concerned with and dependent on the domestic fuels industries are due not only to them but all other members of the Southern Governors' Conference who supported it.

I earnestly urge President Kennedy and his advisers, as well as Members of Congress, to carefully consider the recommendations by the chief executives of so many of our States to which, both as producers and consumers, domestic fuels are so important.

The text of the resolution adopted at the Southern Governors' Conference follows:

OIL IMPORTS

Whereas the maintenance and encouragement of strong domestic fuels industries are essential to the national economy and essential to the Nation's security; and

Whereas imports of crude oil and its derivatives and products, particularly residual oil used for fuel, constitute a constant and increasing threat to all domestic fuels industries; and

Whereas the manner in which the oil import program which was instituted in 1959 as a national security measure, has been administered raises serious doubts and uncertainties as to the future of the program; and

Whereas there was recently revealed a secret report prepared by a special Cabinet Committee which contains conclusions and recommendations which, if followed, could seriously weaken the domestic oil-producing industries; and

Whereas the President recently issued a proclamation revising the crude oil import program without notice and without public hearing, the net effect of which will be to weaken further the oil import program; and

Whereas imports of residual oil to be used for fuel in district I have increased at an alarming rate even under the oil import program; and

Whereas, a recent study of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended to the President a "meaningful relaxation" of the program as it pertains to residual fuel oil; and

Whereas, both the secret Cabinet Committee study and the report of the Office of Emergency Planning both indicate considerable support within the executive branch for phasing out of the oil import program and the opening of the American fuel market to unlimited imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Governors' Conference—

1. That the President be strongly urged to continue the oil import program as a means of strengthening the national security by avoiding an unnecessary dependence on oil from unreliable and insecure sources and preventing further deterioration of the domestic oil and coal producing industries with wide ranging economic damage to the national economy.

2. That the President be further urged to resist those officials and agencies within the administration who have indicated a desire to phase out the oil import program or to weaken it by increasing the amount of oil which can be imported.

3. That the President be requested to take positive action to strengthen the oil import program so the amount of oil which can be imported will be more effectively controlled.

4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Congress.

AMENDMENT TO NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the economy of this Nation is still not what many of us would like it to be. It is not vibrant and moving as was predicted for it a few short years ago, and which it must be to keep this country foremost in the world picture and to provide satisfactorily for the welfare of all our citizens.

There are a number of programs initiated lately which have attempted to "get the economy moving." I am for several of them: area redevelopment, accelerated public works, manpower retraining. There are others being considered which also hold promise: tax cuts and youth employment, to name a couple.

What distresses me, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain things that can be done by the Federal Government in some areas to contribute greatly to the local economy, to increase output, to stimulate employment, which require no new, huge programs. There are some

things the Government can do that will not cost the taxpayer a single penny. As a matter of fact, there are sizable benefits that can be contributed by the Government by its simply refraining from doing anything, by its withdrawing from activities in which it is presently engaged.

Let me discuss an example of what I am talking about. The example may sound small, almost inconsequential; but I can assure you that the problem involved is monumental to the people affected and this sort of situation multiplied many times throughout the country can mount up.

In Louisiana we have several parishes—some folks who do not know call them counties—known as the Florida parishes. The name derives from the fact that this part of the State was once a part of West Florida. These parishes—St. Helena, Livingston, Tangipahoa, Washington, and St. Tammany—lie in eastern Louisiana, north of New Orleans and Lake Ponchartrain.

These parishes, like many in Louisiana lately, have had their economic ills. Their per capita income is down; their unemployment is up. As a result, they have been designated eligible for assistance under the Federal Government's accelerated public works and area redevelopment programs. While I am sure these programs will be of benefit to this area, there is something fundamental causing the sickness that has inflicted the economy of this part of the State, something which will not be cured by this massive Federal assistance, but something which can be corrected by simple Federal action.

This "something" of which I speak is the inordinately high price charged for natural gas in this area. Natural gas is one of the bulwarks of the Louisiana economy. We produce more natural gas than any other State in the Union. Then, why should any part of our State pay high prices for the commodity? It is because the Federal Government, through the Federal Power Commission, has proclaimed jurisdiction over the gas consumed in the Florida parishes and has permitted the gas company serving the area to charge ridiculously high prices for the gas.

The consumers—municipalities, businesses, and individuals alike—in these Florida parishes are presently paying one-third to one-half higher rates than their neighbors, as close as the other side of Lake Ponchartrain in New Orleans, pay. The rates are ruinous. They are causing manufacturing plants not to locate, businesses to fold, employees to be laid off, and householders to tighten up on other expenditures. The result is that the area is in the grip of an ever-deepening recession.

There is no reason why this need occur. The Louisiana Public Service Commission, the State agency which regulates utilities, has rightly claimed jurisdiction over the gas. There is no question that, if the Louisiana Public Service Commission were to exercise regulatory power over the rates of such gas, those rates would be lower. The rates are lower in nearby areas where the gas is from the same sources and

where the Louisiana Public Service Commission does the regulating.

Because the State agency did claim jurisdiction over gas in the Florida parishes, the matter was taken before the Federal Power Commission for a decision. The FPC trial examiner ruled that part of the gas was shipped intrastate to the Florida parishes and therefore was not subject to the FPC jurisdiction, but was within the regulating province of the State body. However, as to the remainder of the gas, the trial examiner ruled that it was shipped into the Florida parishes from the lands off the coast of Louisiana, the Outer Continental Shelf, and that it was therefore to be considered gas in interstate commerce over which the FPC did have sole control.

I think that latter portion of the trial examiner's decision was erroneous. So did the people in my State who have taken exceptions to the decision. Those exceptions are presently before the Commission for a ruling. I think that the decision was erroneous because I do not think that gas traveling from the Outer Continental Shelf to a destination in a State, which does not travel through any other State, can be considered interstate commerce. Interstate commerce is anything that crosses into one State from another State; nowhere in the law defining interstate commerce, in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, or in the Natural Gas Act, is gas or anything else which goes into one State from off that State's shore said to be interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and not to be regulated by the State's utility commission.

However, since the trial examiner ruled the way he did and until the Commission should reverse him and rule otherwise, this gas will continue to be regulated by the FPC, the FPC will apparently continue to permit the rates being charged in the Florida parishes, and the citizens of this area will continue to suffer under these oppressive rates.

The Federal Government, as I said, could very simply remedy this situation by relinquishing its jurisdiction through the Federal Power Commission over the rates charged for gas in the area. This I urge them to do. Therefore, I am attempting to bring relief to the people of the Florida parishes by introducing a bill which will, in effect, reduce their gas rates to a reasonable level.

If the FPC continues to refuse to help our people, then I hope this bill I introduce would do this by denying to the Federal Power Commission the right to exercise jurisdiction over gas which travels only from offshore lands into one State. Such gas or any other commerce moving directly between any point on the Outer Continental Shelf would be excluded from the definition of interstate commerce. If the gas were not considered interstate commerce, the jurisdiction over it then would fall to the proper State authority. And, in the case of Louisiana, the Public Service Commission would set the rates in the Florida parishes at a much lower level, just as it has done in other areas of the State,

while still insuring to the gas company reasonable profits.

We must be prepared to withdraw the Federal Government from activity where its presence is harmful to the economy, just as we so often are willing to push the Federal Government into new fields to spur the economy. If the Federal agencies are not willing to do this by their own leave, then we in Congress must take this responsibility upon ourselves. Thus, I hope we shall take favorable action rapidly on this bill and save an important area of my State from economic collapse.

INTERAMA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and Members of the House will be interested to know of the tremendous interest in my Third Congressional District, of all Dade County and the entire State of Florida in the great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. Work is underway in filling the land for this international exposition and cultural center which is scheduled to open in 1965 and remain open for many many years.

In this connection I would like to call attention of the Members to remarks by Mr. Farrar Newberry, former president of the Woodmen of the World, given recently at a meeting of that splendid organization at Miami Beach.

I would also mention to the Members a letter from William E. Stephenson, president of the North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Members will also be interested, I am sure, in reading the text of editorials which were aired recently over radio station WGBS in Miami and television station WLBW-TV—Channel 10—in Miami.

These are only samples of the interest which is current in my district and throughout Florida for this great project which you will be hearing more about.

INTERAMA

The Woodmen of the World inaugurated a wide program of public service just 20 years ago, with a feeling of obligation as well as of desire. That program began with the awarding of American flags by its camps to schools, churches, libraries, scout troops, and others, and American history medals to students most proficient in that study. It came to include gifts and equipment to hospitals and schools. It honored citizens of outstanding capacity with plaques and citations.

It has placed more than 50 bronze plaques to mark historic sites and honor the Nation's great men. It has thus paid tribute to five Presidents of the United States, and such personalities as William Jennings Bryan, Uncle Joe Cannon, Stephen Foster, Buffalo Bill, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forest, and Gen. John J. Pershing. It indicated the spot where Lindbergh left in the *Spirit of St. Louis* to span the sea.

Now, most of those were tributes to people long since dead and to events of the past. All are historic.

It remains for us of this time and at this place to pay tribute to an idea—an idea not yet come to full reality—the idea of establishing a great institution on a large acreage right here in Florida which we believe destined to rank among the wonders of the world. That idea is to make practicable the American way of life and emphasize by a visible and tangible method the eternal friendship which exists between the nations of the North American continent. It is called Interama—which means “among or between” the Americas—denoting a togetherness of neighbors in purpose and activity.

Interama, when its physical plant is completed 2 or 3 years from now, will provide a spectacle unparalleled in history, and will emphasize by all time that peace, happiness, and prosperity unite the peoples and countries of this continent.

For the construction of Interama, just north of here, Miami has given 1,700 acres of land. Florida is paying for access roads to cost some \$8 to \$10 million. Dade County is contributing half a million for preliminary study and planning, and the Federal Government, through the Area Development Administration, has been asked for exhibits to cost \$25 million and a grant of \$50 million. Interama's operation is in the hands of the Inter-American Center Authority, set up by the Legislature of Florida. It includes 11 of our most able citizens, chairmaned by the very capable Dr. Irving Muskat. This authority will manage the financing of the project. A \$21 million bond issue has been validated by the court, and \$8 million of it, now being used for preparation of the grounds and administration, has been oversubscribed.

Here will be built, not another World's Fair, to last for a year or so, but a permanent assembly of exhibits from all countries, with special emphasis on participation by the Latin American nations.

Interama will establish four great areas: international, industrial, cultural, and festival. The combined public and private investment will exceed \$500 million and it is believed that in a very few years jobs will be provided for at least 100,000 people.

And now, for a project which will mean so much to so many people—a project dedicated to progress with freedom—a project designed for the unity of the peoples of this continent—I am proud to present, on behalf of Woodmen of the World's national officers and the Sovereign Camp representing over 400,000 fine American fraternalists, this bronze testimonial of our good wishes and our belief that what this world needs most today is not guided missiles, but guided men.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, Washington, D.C.

Re Washington Report, volume 2, No. 32, dated August 2, 1963, and Congressional Action, volume 7, No. 30, dated August 2, 1963, editorials on the Area Redevelopment Act.

GENTLEMEN: The board of directors of the North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce have been following your editorials in the Washington Report and Congressional Action publications and in particular the ones above mentioned.

Generally speaking we agree, that sound business practice does not call for deficit spending, however, exceptions to the general rule must be invoked at times to accomplish the desired result.

We must admit that it is not too difficult for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to create a policy of no deficit spending as being for the good of the country as a whole. How-

ever, it must be conceded that there are areas in our vast country that are depressed, and wherein the Area Redevelopment Act would do the greatest good both directly and indirectly for the country as a whole. Dade County, Fla., is a depressed area due primarily to the influx of Cuban refugees from Communist Cuba. This problem is national in scope and not only a Dade County problem.

Permit us to bring to your attention what the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act would mean to the economy of Florida and indirectly to the southeastern part of the United States. It would create a permanent \$1 billion increase in Florida's income from tourists due to Interama. (Note: Enclosed is a fact sheet on Interama.) Create jobs for Cuban refugees thereby saving millions of dollars now being expended on their subsistence program; Interama will generate 239 million more spending each year in lodging; 185 million in additional food and drink; 130 million in amusements; 93 million in groceries; 81 million in gasoline; 73 million in souvenirs and gifts; 41 million in drugs; 25 million in doctors, barbers, etc.; 17 million in utilities; and to service the additional millions of visitors who will come to Florida to visit Interama, 100,000 new permanent jobs will be generated. (Note: Enclosed is a statement by Dr. Irving E. Muskat, chairman of Interama at congressional committee hearings, Mar. 15, 1963.)

We believe that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should analyze the above facts including the enclosed Interama fact sheet and statement of Dr. Irving Muskat, so as to further evaluate the effect the Area Redevelopment Act would have on our depressed area, and other areas in the various parts of the United States at which Federal intervention and help would be more effective in solving problems, in that, local initiative would be inadequate.

With billions of dollars being allotted to foreign aid, the grants under the ARA would be picaresque in comparison thereto, however, such grants would amount to capital expenditures with dividends ensuing therefrom to our citizenry.

Let us take a second and more realistic view of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Very truly yours,

NORTH MIAMI BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
WILLIAM E. STEPHENSON,
President.

PAUL MILLER, Secretary.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN DADE

This is a WLBW-TV editorial.

Soon to come before the House of Representatives in Washington is a bill which will, among other things, set the criteria for depressed areas. Should this bill receive favorable consideration by the House, it would mean that Dade County would qualify for Federal funds for the construction of public projects such as sewers, streets, roads, and probably, what is most important of all, it would mean the dream of Interama would become a reality.

Funds derived because of this legislative move would be made available for the construction of Interama facilities which would, of course, in and by itself employ many thousands of people. Once Interama becomes a reality it will mean thousands of jobs year in and year out.

We urge the Florida Representatives to carefully consider the wisdom of this bill and help provide the aid that is so necessary as a result of our Cuban visitors. A similar bill was defeated in the House by a very small margin, so small in fact that had the Florida delegation voted for the bill, it would have passed.

Channel 10 believes it is vitally necessary that Dade County receive this invaluable

help. We urge our lawmakers in Washington to give the bill their unqualified support.

This has been a WLBW-TV editorial. We welcome, from responsible sources, opinions other than those expressed in this editorial and will offer time for the presentation of those opinions.

EDITORIAL VOICED BY BERNARD E. NEARY, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, WGBS, MIAMI, FLA.

Congressional action to make Dade eligible for special Federal aid, because of its intertwined problems of a high unemployment rate and the heavy influx of Cuban exiles, has taken on an encouraging momentum.

Latest move in the long and uphill struggle to bring added financial relief to this area, and further recognition of its unique problems as host to the flood of exiles, came in the U.S. House yesterday.

The House Banking and Currency Committee reported out favorably legislation extending the Area Redevelopment Act, along with an amendment tailored to fit Dade's special needs.

This amendment makes any county eligible for ARA funds, which has a substantial unemployment problem and a Cuban population of more than 50,000. Dade qualifies on both points, of course. It is, in fact, the only area in the Nation to do so.

The measure now goes to the House floor for action. It already has been approved by the Senate, which means only one hurdle remains.

WGBS views with a critical eye most efforts to lean on government for economic aid. There are exceptions to be sure, and we believe Dade's situation is one of them. Consider these facts:

Although resettlement is progressing at a good rate, nearly 100,000 Cuban refugees still remain in the area.

Unemployment in Dade, including the refugees seeking jobs, was estimated at 45,100 in June, about 10 percent of the labor force.

Dade had the highest total of unemployment compensation paid to the jobless in the State during June.

If the House approves the measure, it would make the county eligible for millions of dollars for job-creating projects and enable Interama to get off the ground.

Dade has a valid claim for added relief. It has carried the main burden of the Cuban influx, properly a matter of national concern. WGBS trusts that the House Members will share that belief and act accordingly.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY—A CULTURED, RATIONAL, CALM, PERCEPTIVE, AND WELL-SPOKEN AMERICAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one fundamental trait of the American Presidency is that the mantle of our land's highest public office is enriched by the capacity of contracting or expanding to fit the potential stature of the wearer. The Presidency is widely held to be a symbol of the world's greatest democracy reflecting America's vigor, its effectiveness, and its potentials.

Richard Wilson's latest journalistic portrait of John Fitzgerald Kennedy reveals the strength with which other foremost American Presidents have exercised their duties and responsibilities, partly as a matter of their own character struc-

ture and inner drive and partly of the philosophy with which they have approached the office of the Presidency.

The details of Mr. Wilson's portrait are familiar to many Americans who, in the presidential election of 1960, became acquainted with John F. Kennedy's clear understanding of the Presidency as well as his strong fascination and absorption with all the facets and the numerous demands which influence the President's roles as Chief Executive, as chief legislator, as party leader, and as the Commander in Chief.

It is a portrait which, I am convinced, reveals President Kennedy's fundamental strength and feeling of human immediacy, characteristics which are essential and desirable to give the ordinary American the sense that he is not unimportant and that he has someone to speak and act for him.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include as part of my remarks the trenchant observations of Richard Wilson as to President Kennedy's personal conduct in our Nation's highest office.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1963]

PERSONAL CONDUCT IN HIGH OFFICE—PRESIDENT LAUDED FOR HIGHEST STANDARD IN BOTH PUBLIC AND FAMILY LIFE

(By Richard Wilson)

The world is much concerned, as it ought to be, with standards of human conduct. Moral, ethical and spiritual questions are sharply presented in many different ways. They arise in the private and public lives of officials here and abroad, in the revolution of religious theology and dogma, in the morality of nuclear policy, in the relationships between the races, and, most of all, in the ordinary complexities of modern life.

In this vortex of changing standards and values, when the individual finds himself troubled so much of the time, the conduct of the President of the United States provides a temporal precept and example.

President Kennedy, in his public and family life, has set the very highest standard of American conduct. One need not agree with all, or any, of his policies to recognize that in his behavior, attitude and demeanor he provides the needed example that the troubled or misguided may turn to with respect and admiration.

He is a man of intellectual attainment and with wide and varied interests not confined to public affairs but ranging into the areas of mind and spirit which define the ultimate values of life. We have seen lately his deep concern with his family, not for its advancement or preference but for its form and substance as the treasured and indispensable nucleus of a balanced life, and so little honored by the troubled and misguided.

His qualities of mind and spirit carry over into smaller but more tangible matters of style, and we see a cultivated modern man of vigorous spirit and wit and pleasing habits, manners and appearance.

The essential ingredient is, perhaps, his sense of responsibility for his own official acts, what he says, and how he behaves in his exalted office publicly and privately, partly for the effect this will have in setting a national tone of responsibility.

One would wish that such conduct were universal. Precept and example have not been so greatly honored by an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court whose divorces and remarriages, the latest to a girl 40 years his junior, have humanized the High Tribunal somewhat beyond its deserts.

Nor has the Governor of a leading State contributed to the stability of national cus-

toms by divorcing a wife of 30 years to marry a woman who herself broke up an established family with four children to marry the Governor.

These are not examples which a stable society would wish to follow. They have offended public sensibilities. They reveal instabilities of behavior which scholars have found to be historically characteristic of advanced societies on their way down, and thus out of tune with American society.

High officials must surely recognize, as President Kennedy recognizes, that the probability of their lives should at least match the level of their positions and responsibilities. As in England, there is no room for the unstable in public positions. Once such instability is condoned in prominent persons it is likely to become more general among the unprominent, where it is already general enough. The concept that a public official's private life is his own does not bear close examination in a welfare-state society wherein this official may be directly affecting the lives of others.

Mr. Kennedy's contribution to American standards of behavior is not confined to his family and personal life. His levels of taste, his manner of dress, his way of speaking and articulating his thoughts extemporaneously, as well as the breadth of his education and experience, set a high standard.

He is, in all these respects the finest the United States has to show to itself and to the world—a cultured, rational, calm, perceptive, and well-spoken American.

In other respects it may be permissible to argue with Mr. Kennedy from time to time, and with vigor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DORN (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), for today, August 22, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, on August 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1145. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), relative to the estimated cost of certain facilities proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard within the authorization contained in Public Law 87-554, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1146. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1963 of the claims paid by the Central Intelligence Agency, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, Public Law 79-601; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1147. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to certain annuity increase legislation"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 500. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6225, a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 501. Resolution for consideration of S. 1007, an act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 502. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7544, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 13, pertaining to FTC advisory opinion on joint ads (Rept. No. 699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8204. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in the rates of payments to survivors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8205. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8206. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8207. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8208. A bill to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8209. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission upon its own motion to direct the interconnection of electric facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in order to exclude from the definition of interstate commerce for the purpose

of such act commerce directly between any point in a State and any point on the Outer Continental Shelf and commerce between points in the same State through such Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 8211. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8212. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to restrictions in military areas and zones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8213. A bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to the surface owners of land of certain mineral interests reserved to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8214. A bill to prohibit departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 8215. A bill to delay the applicability of sections 1002(a)(8)(B) and 1602(a)(14)(B) of the Social Security Act under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 8216. A bill to provide equality of treatment for all families and business concerns displaced from real property by actions of the government of the District of Columbia, by authorizing the payment to such families and business concerns of the same amounts now authorized to be paid in the case of displacements from urban renewal project areas; and to provide that all families so displaced shall be given the same preference to fill vacancies in housing as is now given families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment by subsection (b) of section 8 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (by request):

H.R. 8217. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 8218. A bill to amend section 902(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide penalties for fraudulent sales of certain air transportation by ticket agents or their representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8219. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit obsolete or excess materials under the control of the Department of Defense to be donated to 4-H Clubs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebioxen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients, and providing for a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebioxen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 662. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 499. Resolution to provide funds for the further expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8220. A bill for the relief of Hairabed G. Baghdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8221. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alkinoos Vourlekis and his wife, Fotini Grammenos Vourlekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 8222. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Maurus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 8223. A bill for the relief of Janet Ruth McIsaac Austin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 503. Resolution to refer a private bill (H.R. 7151) to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

253. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. R. Hughes and others, Rusk County Conservative Club, Henderson, Tex., relative to a resolution approved August 12 by the Rusk County Conservative Club relating to the action by the President of the United States, by edict rather than by law, has ordered all military commanders in the several States where military facilities are located, to inspect areas surrounding such facilities and, if in his opinion, based on the President's intent and purpose, there is the least so-called discrimination against any Negroes, in or out of the Armed Forces, such commander must at once order such areas off limits to the Armed Forces, and that the Rusk County Conservative Club feels that such an edict is clearly illegal and violates the Constitution of the United States, and that such act and purpose be condemned as Government by armed force, and a deliberate violation of the President's oath of office for which he should be impeached and removed from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation to inject a quarter of a billion dollars more in silver coin into circulation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

255. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation to restore absolutely the three-branch system of Federal Government, as provided in the immortal Constitution of the United States, thus either abolishing certain regulatory independent agencies or transferring them to their most likely Cabinet executive department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

256. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be published as a House document a list of all the men who were next in line, at various periods of time in U.S. history, to succeed to the U.S. Presidency, but who were not elected Vice Presidents as such; to the Committee on House Administration.

257. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be published as a House document the speeches of the pro-Unionists in the secession conventions of the 11 States of the old Confederacy, 1860-61; to the Committee on House Administration.

258. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to initiate a sense-of-Congress resolution to the effect that during this cold war era the Madison Doctrine takes precedence over and before the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

259. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to emphasize music in all cultural legislation, above and beyond all the other arts, and requesting that there be erected a structure known as the American National Music Hall; to the Committee on Public Works.

260. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to provide by rule for a special secret poll of its Members to determine where political power in this Nation really is located, and the relationship of said political power to concentrated wealth in America, and that the results of this poll be publicly released as a House document; to the Committee on Rules.

261. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be adopted a rule requiring all Members of the U.S. House, during their official terms of office, not to practice any profession or occupation for a fee of monetary value, nor to hold any salaried position in any business other than that of Member of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

262. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to investigate the overrepresentation of Ivy League (Yale, Harvard, Princeton, etc.) graduates in executive branch positions in the Federal Government paying \$15,000 per annum or more; it being obvious that the Ivy League has sewed things up—they should have no greater percentage of graduates in top Federal posts than any other comparable number of college graduates; to the Committee on Rules.

263. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities appoint a Member of the House to read to the House representative selections from the U.S. House speeches of "Radical Republicans," 1863-75; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

264. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation which contemplates totally extinguishing the U.S. public debt by the year 2000 A.D. by having the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee estimate the total wealth and assessed valuation of the people of the United States of America, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Advancement by Step Increases of Certain Field Service Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain field service postal employees.

Public Law 87-793, known as the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, established the basic principles of (a) equal pay for substantially equal work; and (b) com-

parability of Federal salary rates with private enterprise salary rates. However, the effective date of Public Law 87-793 as it applied to salary rates, to wit, August 12, 1962, acted as a cutoff point with respect to immediate and future pay increases.

Unfortunately, this cutoff point caused various inequitable situations to develop, affecting particularly postal employees in levels 1 through 6 whose total postal service exceeded 6 years. In some cases, junior employees were advanced further in the salary scale than employees with many more years of service. Unless these inequities are corrected expeditiously, they will be further compounded by future wage adjustments.

The bill I have introduced today proposes to correct the main inequities arising out of the enactment of Public Law 87-793 by granting postal employees in

levels 1 through 6 full credit toward their salary grades for all postal service performed by them.

Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in voting a few days ago to continue our temporary national debt limit at \$309 billion, has continued the trend of a decade in